




3 1761 11970460 9

GOVT PUBNS

GOVT PUBNS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

Doc
an
om
HD
1781
A38
1952
NO.1
HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952
1074

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.)

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE [8 reports]

Respecting

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

No. 1

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1952

WITNESSES:

The Right Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Minister, Mr. J. G. Taggart, C.B.E.,
Deputy Minister, and Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General,
Department of Agriculture.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1952



STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Chairman: Arthur J. Bater, Esq.

Messrs.

Anderson	Demers	Major
Argue	Diefenbaker	Masse
Arsenault	Dinsdale	McCubbin
Aylesworth	Dumas	McLean (<i>Huron-Perth</i>)
Bennett	Fair	McWilliam
Black (<i>Chateauguay-</i>	Fontaine	Murray (<i>Oxford</i>)
<i>Huntingdon-Laprairie</i>)	Gauthier (<i>Lapointe</i>)	Murray (<i>Cariboo</i>)
Blue	George	Proudfoot
Breton	Gour (<i>Russell</i>)	Quelch
Browne (<i>St. John's West</i>)	Harkness	Richard (<i>St. Maurice-</i>
Bruneau	Hetland	<i>Lafleche</i>)
Bryce	Jutras	Roberge
Cardiff	Jones	Ross (<i>Souris</i>)
Catherwood	Kent	Stewart (<i>Yorkton</i>)
Charlton	Kickham	Welbourn
Clark	Kirk (<i>Antigonish-</i>	White (<i>Middlesex East</i>)
Corry	<i>Guysborough</i>)	Whitman
Cote (<i>Matapedia-Matane</i>)	Kirk (<i>Digby-Yarmouth</i>)	Wood
Courtemanche	Laing	Wright
Cruikshank	MacKenzie	Wylie
Darroch	McLean (<i>Queens</i>)	

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, March 18, 1952.

Resolved,—That the following Members do compose the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization:—

Messrs:

Anderson	Darroch	MacLean (<i>Queens</i>)
Argue	Demers	Major
Arsenault	Diefenbaker	Masse
Aylesworth	Dinsdale	McCubbin
Bater	Dumas	McLean (<i>Huron-Perth</i>)
Bennett	Fair	McWilliam
Black (<i>Chateauguay- Huntingdon-Laprairie</i>)	Fontaine	Murray (<i>Oxford</i>)
Blue	Gauthier (<i>Lapointe</i>)	Murray (<i>Cariboo</i>)
Breton	George	Proudfoot
Browne (<i>St. John's West</i>)	Gour (<i>Russell</i>)	Quelch
Bruneau	Harkness	Richard (<i>St. Maurice- Lafleche</i>)
Bryce	Hetland	Roberge
Cardiff	Jutras	Ross (<i>Souris</i>)
Catherwood	Jones	Stewart (<i>Yorkton</i>)
Charlton	Kent	Welbourn
Clark	Kickham	White (<i>Middlesex East</i>)
Corry	Kirk (<i>Antigonish- Guysborough</i>)	Whitman
Cote (<i>Matapedia-Matane</i>)	Kirk (<i>Digby-Yarmouth</i>)	Wood
Courtemanche	Laing	Wright
Cruikshank	MacKenzie	Wylie

Ordered,—That the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

MONDAY, April 28, 1952.

Ordered,—That the Report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the crop year 1950-1951, tabled on March 18, 1952, together with the Report of the Board of Grain Commissioners for 1951, tabled this day, be referred to the said Committee.

TUESDAY, April 29, 1952.

Ordered,—That the subject of the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the Province of Saskatchewan and its attendant ramifications be referred immediately to the said Committee.

TUESDAY, April 29, 1952.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Stewart (*Yorkton*) be substituted for that of Mr. Studer on the said Committee.

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1952.

Ordered,—That the said Committee be granted leave to sit while the House is sitting.

Ordered,—That the said Committee be empowered to print from day to day, such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee, and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Decore be substituted for that of Mr. Clark on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization begs leave to present the following as its

FIRST REPORT

Your Committee recommends:

1. That it be granted leave to sit while the House is sitting.
2. That it be empowered to print, from day to day, such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee, and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR J. BATER,
Chairman.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Clark, Corry, Cote (*Matapedia-Matane*), Darroch, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kickham, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), MacKenzie, MacLean (*Queens*), Major, Masse, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Oxford*), Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Richard (*St. Maurice-Lafleche*), Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Welbourn, White (*Middlesex East*), Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: The Right Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Minister, and Mr. J. G. Taggart, Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

The Clerk read the Committee's Orders of Reference.

On motion of Mr. Clark,—

Resolved,—That the Committee recommend that it be granted leave to sit while the House is sitting.

On motion of Mr. Whitman,—

Resolved,—That the Committee recommend that it be empowered to print, from day to day, such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee.

On motion of Mr. Wood,—

Resolved,—That a sub-committee on agenda and procedure, comprising the Chairman and nine members to be named by him, be appointed.

The Committee proceeded to consideration of the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the province of Saskatchewan.

On motion of Mr. Murray (*Cariboo*),—

Resolved,—That the first witness heard be Mr. J. G. Taggart, C.B.E., Deputy Minister of Agriculture, to be followed by Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, and Dr. C. A. Mitchell, Chief of the Division of Animal Pathology, Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Taggart was called, heard regarding the organization of the Department and questioned.

The Chairman named the following members to the sub-committee on agenda and procedure: Messrs. Argue, Charlton, Hetland, Laing, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*).

At 1 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Breton, Browne (*St. John's*

West), Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Darroch, Decore, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kent, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), MacLean (*Queens*), Major, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Oxford*), Quelch, Richard (*St. Maurice-Lafleche*), Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Welbourn, Whitman, Wright.

In attendance: The Right Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Minister, Mr. J. G. Taggart, C.B.E., Deputy Minister, and Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, Department of Agriculture.

On motion of Mr. Bennett,—

Ordered,—That the Committee print, from day to day, 1,000 copies in English and 200 copies in French of its minutes of proceedings and evidence relating to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan.

The Chairman tabled a copy of Sessional Paper No. 169 F, which was ordered to be printed as *Appendix A* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Examination of Mr. Taggart was continued.

Mr. Taggart filed *Report of Inspector, Declaration by Inspector and Licence for Removal of Animals from Infected Place*, all dated at Regina, Sask., December 28, 1951, which were ordered to be printed as *Appendix B* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Mr. Gardiner was called and questioned.

Mr. Taggart retired.

Dr. Childs was called and heard.

At 6 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday, May 1, at 11 o'clock a.m.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

APRIL 30, 1952.

11.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please, gentlemen. I will ask the secretary to read the order of reference in connection with these meetings and other subsequent meetings.

CLERK OF COMMITTEE: Tuesday, March 18, 1952, Resolved that the following members do compose the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and the members are listed.

On the same day, ordered that the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

On Monday, April 28, ordered that the Report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the crop year 1950-1951, tabled on March 18, 1952, together with the Report of the Board of Grain Commissioners for 1951, tabled this day, be referred to the said committee.

On Tuesday, April 29, ordered that the subject of the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the province of Saskatchewan and its attendant ramifications be referred immediately to the said committee.

On the same date, ordered that the name of Mr. Stewart (*Yorkton*) be substituted for that of Mr. Studer on the said committee.

(Sgd) LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the next order of business will be a motion recommending that the committee be granted leave to sit while the House is sitting.

Mr. CLARK: I move that the committee be empowered to sit while the House is in session.

The CHAIRMAN: You have all heard the motion. What is your wish?
Carried.

A motion will now be in order recommending that the committee be empowered from day to day to print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee.

Mr. WHITMAN: I have the pleasure to move that the committee recommend printing from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: You have all heard the motion. All in favour?

Mr. WRIGHT: What number of copies will be printed?

The CHAIRMAN: I think the number of copies to be printed will be decided at a later meeting, after this report goes into the House.

What is your wish on this motion?

Carried.

Now we should have a motion to appoint a steering committee comprising the chairman and nine members named by him.

Mr. WOOD: In order to have the work of the committee run more smoothly I think we should have a steering committee consisting of about ten members, including the chairman, and I move that the chairman be authorized to select a committee consisting of ten members of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: You have all heard the motion. All in favour?

Carried.

Now we will come to the procedure. For the information of the committee I would now state that we have with us this morning Mr. J. G. Taggart, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, who would be prepared to give a brief statement on the organization of the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of making clear to the committee the place and function of each of the divisions concerned with the control of animal diseases.

Following Mr. Taggart, it is suggested that the committee hear Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, who is the professional and administrative head of the Health of Animals division.

Following Dr. Childs, it is suggested that the committee hear Dr. C. A. Mitchell, who is chief of the division of Animal Pathology.

Would some one move that that would be the procedure to start the inquiry?

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): I so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. George Murray. You have all heard the motion of Mr. Murray that the procedure as suggested to start the inquiry be adopted. All in favour? Opposed?

Agreed.

Now we have to decide on the next meeting, the business and witnesses to be called. I presume we will take that up at the conclusion of this meeting.

Mr. FAIR: Mr. Chairman, when dealing with that matter, I suggest you get a larger room than this one, because there is here a danger of contamination of foot and mouth disease and we have to look out for that.

The CHAIRMAN: As I said, we have Mr. J. G. Taggart, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, with us this morning.

Mr. BROWNE: That is a practical suggestion that was made about getting a larger room. Those of us who are standing would like to sit down. Is there any chance of getting more chairs or getting a larger room?

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but the large railway committee room is being occupied this morning. It is regretful, but we are rather short of rooms.

Mr. BROWNE: I suppose, then, we can get some more chairs?

Mr. J. G. Taggart, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that a brief statement on the organization of the Department of Agriculture, with particular reference to the place of those divisions concerned with the control of disease, would be helpful to the committee. Accordingly, I shall try to give you that brief statement. First, the department consists of operating units which might be described as commodity divisions. These divisions in turn are grouped under administrative heads on something approaching a functional basis. The main groups are, and I am thinking of the regular departmental organization, Production, Marketing, Experimental farms and Science Service. In addition, there are the other administrative groups having to do with rehabilitation, marshland and prairie, and the price of Support function of the Prices Support Board and the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, but I am not mentioning them

further because they have no part to play in this particular examination. The production division or Production Service, rather, is the one within which the Health of Animals division functions. The other major divisions in that production service are Livestock and Poultry and Plant Products. These divisions, all of them, deal with production matters or matters that affect production. In the main, they have to do with the promotion, control and protection of animals and crops, and not with the marketing, and not with scientific research. They are, therefore, mainly enforcement and administrative divisions. The Health of Animals division of the production service, then, is a division of the department which administers the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, the Meat and Canned Foods Act, and all of the regulations made under those Acts. They are essentially a protective and enforcement organization. Now, the other main division to which you may wish to direct your attention is the Animal Pathology division, whose main job is research into animal diseases and all the things related thereto. In addition, that division does routine testing and checking and supplies laboratory services generally to the Health of Animals division and some other divisions that require that type of service. I repeat, the main function of the Animal Pathology division is research into animal diseases. I should have told you, Mr. Chairman, that the Health of Animals division is headed by Dr. Thomas Childs, who is described as Veterinary Director General, while the Animal Pathology division functioning within Science Service is headed by Dr. Charles A. Mitchell, who is chief of that division with laboratories not only in Hull, where the headquarters are, but at various other points across the country. Therefore, you will see from this brief statement respecting these two divisions that the one, the Health of Animals division functioning in the production service has to do with protective, regulatory and control measures, while the Animal Pathology division functioning in the science service has the main job of conducting research, and the secondary job of providing laboratory and technical services to other divisions.

Perhaps only one other point need be made in order to make this whole position clear, and that is that the heads of the two divisions to which I have referred, namely, Dr. Childs and Dr. Mitchell, report respectively to Mr. Young, who is director of the Production service, and to Dr. Neatby, who is director of the Science Service, and those officers in turn report to the deputy. The grouping of divisions to which I have referred was made in 1937-38, and the purpose of that grouping at that time was to bring together research and scientific organizations in one broad group, and administrative and enforcement divisions in another broad group.

Mr. Chairman, I have made no reference to the marketing service, and I think perhaps I need not take the time of the committee to do that. If there is any question respecting what I have said, of course, I shall be ready to answer it. Now, it is my duty of course, Mr. Chairman, to produce at your request any of the officers of the department whom you may wish to examine, and to produce any documents or information which we have that the committee requires—subject of course to whatever rules govern these documents.

May I offer one observation with all respect. If and when you come to examine the veterinarians, of whom there are a considerable number in the line of responsibility, would you give us as much notice as you can of when these men will be required. If it can be done we would appreciate it a good deal if each man could be examined fully and discharged quickly so that he may return to his duties. I make that request and I feel sure the committee will go as far as the committee can possibly go in meeting it.

Now I have nothing further unless some questions are to be asked.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any member of the committee desire to ask any questions?

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Taggart one or two questions. He has told us that Dr. Childs and Dr. Mitchell report to Dr. Young and to Dr. Neatby and that they in turn report to him as deputy minister. What was the date of the first report received by you, through those gentlemen, Mr. Taggart, in regard to the outbreak of some disease among animals in the Regina area?—A. I do not think I can give you the exact date, Mr. Chairman, because the first information came to me verbally from Dr. Young and it would be during the first week of February.

Q. And up until that first week of February then, Mr. Taggart, you had received no report regarding the outbreak of disease among animals in the Regina area?—A. No report that made sufficient impression on me in any event to stay in my mind. So, if there was an earlier report I have no recollection of it.

Q. I am not suggesting there was. And, during the period from the 27th of November until this date early in February, did either Dr. Young or Dr. Neatby give you to understand that there was anything serious among cattle in that area?—A. No, I had no report at all that I recall prior to the first of February.

Q. And about what date or approximately when was that in February that you received the first report?—A. The first report of a disease which later turned out to be foot and mouth disease, reported as stomatitis, would be within or before the first week of February. If I had to fix a date it would be about the 2nd of February or the 3rd.

Q. Did you then have occasion to interview Dr. Childs or to talk the matter over with him or Dr. Mitchell?—A. Shortly after that with both of them, yes.

Q. With both? When was it on the first occasion, as far as you can remember, and I know how difficult it is, that you discussed this question with Dr. Childs?—A. It would be within a week of when I first had the report from Dr. Young.

Q. In looking over the documents that were brought down yesterday there was a reference on January 4th to a communication from Dr. Childs to Dr. Christie regarding a report made by Dr. James. Was that report of Dr. James brought to your attention at all until after your first conversation with Dr. Young or Dr. Neatby as the case may be early in February?—A. No, I never see those routine reports unless I ask for them specially.

Q. Those reports were not brought to your attention?—A. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

By Mr. Browne:

Q. I would like to ask the deputy minister from whom that verbal report originated regarding the disease? Did it come from the laboratory or from the field?—A. It came to me from Dr. Young, the director of the production division.

Q. Where did it originate? Who was he reporting for? It came through him to you?—A. Yes, and he in turn, according to the routine, must have received it from Dr. Childs.

Mr. WRIGHT: As a result of any reports you received was there any action you took with regard to this yourself, as deputy minister?

The WITNESS: No, I took no special action at the time Dr. Young first reported to me that this vesicular stomatitis was in Regina; but at that time

Dr. Young informed me of what action was under way and it seemed to me to be sufficient—so I gave no further directions.

Mr. STEWART: When you say you took no action there was action taken by other officials of the department?

The WITNESS: Correct. The action was reported to me and there was nothing further I could do at the moment.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What particular action was taken as a result of this report?—A. The quarantining of premises and the examination of surrounding herds—and all the checks that were in progress at that time.

Q. What date was that first order?—A. I am afraid I cannot give you from memory the date of the first quarantine. It is on the record and I think it will be produced by Dr. Childs.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Did you, Mr. Taggart, discuss with any of your officials in February as to what should be done with samples from infected animals—whether those samples should be subjected to tests within the area where the disease was prevalent or whether they should be sent to the Hull laboratory?—A. I do not think I discussed that point in detail with the officials. It was reported to me that tests and checks were being made.

Q. You were never aware of any discussion or any arguments or any differences of opinion as to whether certain tests should be made in Saskatchewan or whether certain other tests should be made at the Hull laboratory?—A. The only discussion I recall was that tests were being made in the field—had been made in fact—before the matter came to my knowledge at all. I do not recall any further discussion at that time.

Q. Were you made aware of the type of tests that were being made in Saskatchewan?—A. In a general way, yes.

Q. But no one ever suggested to you while that particular type of test was being made that some other tests should be made and samples sent to the Hull laboratory?—A. I do not recall that those points were raised specifically with me.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Well, Mr. Taggart, tests were made in the field and, according to the records produced yesterday, on February 14th there was a telegram from Dr. Carlson, assistant district veterinarian, advising that vesicular specimens were being forwarded by air express. Then, on February 15th there was a wire from Dr. Childs to Dr. Christie countermanding the gathering of specimens and the delivery of such specimens to Hull for analysis or examination. Was a matter as important as the countermanding of instructions that had already been given by Dr. Carlson to Dr. Christie—was that matter brought to your attention in order to get your authority or to discuss it with you?—A. No, I had no knowledge.

Q. That would be a very important stand to take—countermanding a course of action that had been decided upon, would it not?—A. It was an order dealing with a technical point and in the normal routine that would not come to me.

Q. Well, is it not a fact the symptoms of stomatitis and the symptoms of foot and mouth disease are very much alike?—A. I am so informed but I have no knowledge on that myself. I have never seen either one.

Q. But the danger of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease is one that the Department of Agriculture guards against with every care—every Department of Agriculture does that does it not?—A. That is quite true.

Q. And when a question as important as that had to be determined, such a matter would not be brought to your attention at all being of a technical nature?—A. That is correct. It might be but it is not necessary that technical decisions be submitted to the deputy for approval or otherwise.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Taggart, Dr. Childs sent out a telegram to Dr. Christie as referred to, countermanding the sending of specimens to the Hull laboratory, and on February 25th Dr. Mitchell reported foot and mouth disease as a result of the tests that had been made. Would you tell me what happened to Dr. Childs' order that specimens should not be tested—when they were in fact tested?

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, these are matters which are not strictly within my knowledge and I would prefer the committee to get answers from men who know them.

Mr. STEWART: Dr. Childs will be the next witness.

Mr. MURRAY: Might I ask whether there was any communication from the province of Saskatchewan's Department of Agriculture or from the University of Saskatchewan regarding this outbreak?

Mr. STEWART: Prior to February 15th?

The WITNESS: I do not remember any communications from the province to my office prior to that date. There were subsequent to that but I do not remember any prior to that.

Mr. ARGUE: But there were reports made by at least one provincial government to the Federal Department of Agriculture in Regina that there was a contagious disease in the Regina area?

The WITNESS: I cannot answer that question, Mr. Chairman. I have no personal knowledge of that and as I was just saying I have no recollection of any report or document coming to my office.

By Mr. Murray:

Q. They have veterinarians in that department at Regina?—A. Our Health and Animals branch?

Q. No, at Regina, for the province of Saskatchewan?—A. They have provincial veterinarians and there are veterinarian professors in the university.

Q. This was occurring right in the shadow of the parliament buildings in Regina?—A. A short distance away.

Mr. ARGUE: So a return to the federal branch, as I understand the information given out, was made by the provincial veterinary, and he was following the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. Animal contagious diseases are the responsibility of the federal department, as I understand it. The obligation of the provincial department is to make a report to the federal department; and that report was made; so they fulfilled their obligation.

Mr. MURRAY: (*Cariboo*): I would like to ask the deputy minister if this report had been made to him from the provincial authorities?

The WITNESS: Well, as I have said, I have no recollection of any reports having come to my office during the early stages of this trouble. I did have correspondence subsequently from the provincial deputy minister.

Mr. BROWNE: When that wire was received on February 2nd or 3rd, was it suggested to you that it might be foot and mouth disease?

The WITNESS: It was suggested at that time that the symptoms of this disease were similar to those of foot and mouth disease; and accordingly further investigation was made immediately to determine what the disease was.

Mr. ARGUE: Can the deputy minister tell us whether he on the men in his department—

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that when the members ask questions they rise, because it is absolutely impossible for us to hear the question being asked.

Mr. ARGUE: My question is this: did the deputy minister or his department receive at any time a request from anyone, either in the department or outside the department, either a veterinary or a layman, that the proper tests should be made, such as would be done if the disease happened to be foot and mouth disease?

The WITNESS: I do not believe that I am able to answer that question in full, Mr. Chairman. I cannot recall off-hand communications that are in the departmental files, especially in the Health of Animals division files on that matter. What I am trying to tell the committee is what I have knowledge of, personally; and I presume that is what you want me to do.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Have you a veterinary located in Regina, representing the federal Health of Animals branch?—A. Yes. Dr. Christie is there; he is the district veterinary in Regina.

Q. Has he any other veterinary assistants in the field there?—A. Oh yes; there are a number of other veterinaries who are normally in that province and who work under Dr. Christie's direction. But, of course, the force has now been greatly augmented by other men having moved in.

Q. Would you know the name of the chief provincial veterinary who is located there?—A. I am sorry, but at the moment I do not recall his name. Oh, Dr. Johnson, I believe, is the provincial veterinary.

Q. You would not recollect, or you would not have a record of when the officials were notified or called in connection with this outbreak?—A. I have not that information at hand; but I think it is in our records and can be produced by the officials who have the documents, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWNE: When did you first report this verbal information that you had received from Dr. Young, to the minister? Did you do it in writing?

The WITNESS: I reported to the minister. He was in the west at the time; that was about the 18th of February.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You say he was in the west?

The WITNESS: He had been in Saskatchewan and he had gone to the west coast. My communication to him was addressed to Victoria. Vancouver, and to Seattle.

Mr. COTE: May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. COTE: There was an article which appeared in Maclean's magazine. Was it right or wrong, in the opinion of the witness.

The WITNESS: I am afraid that I cannot answer that.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Was it by message or by letter that you communicated with the minister?—A. By letter.

Q. In view of the severe manner in which the Department of Agriculture has always looked upon foot and mouth disease, and in view of the danger of it, do you not think that you should have communicated with him before?—A. Possibly; I might have been guilty of having delayed in advising the minister of what the situation was.

Mr. STEWART: Is it not a fact that there never had been, in the history of Canada, an outbreak of foot and mouth disease before this?

The WITNESS: I think that is true. But I have been told there was an outbreak in one case in 1870, I think it was; but again I have no personal knowledge of that, either.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Is it the custom of your Health of Animals branch in Regina, when a contagious disease is reported there, to notify your office in Hull to determine whether the disease is what it is reported to be, or not; or do you make use of the laboratories of the University of Saskatchewan for that purpose?—A. That is a technical question which I think might be better answered by Dr. Childs or by Dr. Mitchell. But in general I would say that if a laboratory diagnosis is required, very frequently I am told that action would be taken at Hull, but not necessarily so. I think the division does use other laboratory facilities at times.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

By Mr. Wright:

Q. In this case, were any samples submitted to the University of Saskatchewan at any time?—A. I am not aware of any; but I cannot answer that question for sure.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Charlton.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. As I understand it, you were first appraised of this situation early in February, either on the 1st or the 2nd day of February?—A. About those dates, yes; I cannot recall the date exactly; it was given to me verbally by Mr. Young.

Q. You were told by Mr. Young at that time of this difficulty verbally, as I understand it?—A. That is right.

Q. Dr. Childs did not get in touch with you personally, at all?—A. Not prior to those dates, that I can remember.

Q. And did you consult any other official of any other branch at that time in view of the seriousness of the situation, Dr. Mitchell, for instance, or any other veterinary who might be in a position to give you advice?—A. Mr. Young informed me at the time that he was in communication with Dr. Mitchell; but I do not recall having communicated with Dr. Mitchell at that time.

Mr. COTE: There must be something wrong, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Mr. Cote; please let Mr. Charlton finish his questioning.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. I realize the position you are in, not being a veterinary yourself, and leaving that entirely with the officials of the branch; but after all, Mr. Taggart, you are the deputy minister and it is partially your responsibility, as I understand it; yet there was nothing done from the 2nd of February until the 13th, I believe. One of the other officials in the department arranged for these samples to be brought down; but there was nothing done in the meantime from the 2nd to the 13th.—A. I do not understand what you mean by "nothing". The division of the Health of Animals was active in studying and examining

and attempting to determine what they were dealing with; but I was not active in that field because that is not my field and I am not qualified to do that.

Q. I realize that; but was there anything to your knowledge done from the time you were first informed on the 1st or 2nd day of February, or did any other official of the department do anything particularly to make sure that this disease was not foot and mouth disease until February 13 when action was taken?—A. Well!

Q. That represents a period of almost two weeks.—A. Veterinaries on the job were actively examining cases and attempting to make tests to determine what they were dealing with.

Q. But as far as we have the evidence in the House, there were no tests made in that time, no actual animal inoculations made, other than clinical examinations; there were no animal inoculations made from the 1st of February to the 13th?—A. That information can be disclosed by the examination of Dr. Childs.

By Mr. Murray (Cariboo):

Q. When did the United States government clamp on the embargo?—A. On the 25th of February.

Q. Did you have any communication with them prior to that date?—A. Yes. The United States government, I think, were informed on the 23rd.

Q. The 23rd of what?—A. The 23rd of February.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. The deputy minister has not any documents before him; but I noticed that on February 18 there was a wire to Dr. Childs in Saskatchewan informing him that Dr. Shahan would arrive in Regina on Wednesday.—A. I may be wrong in my dates.

Q. I mention that, because it is an earlier date.—A. I am sorry if I made an error; I have it in my records somewhere, but I have not got it with me. But subject to correction, Mr. Chairman, I think the communication went from our External Affairs Department to Washington on the 18th of February.

Q. That is why I did not want Mr. Taggart, when he did not have his records before him here, to be in error. Now I have two small matters. One is in regard to this disease known as stomatitis. Have there been frequent outbreaks in recent years in Canada, or have there been any outbreaks to your knowledge, since you have been deputy minister?—A. None to my knowledge in that period of time. But I have been informed that there was an outbreak in Saskatchewan—again subject to correction—I think, in 1938 or 1939.

Q. In 1938 or 1939?—A. Dr. Childs can give that information, I think.

Q. Then, passing on from that point, once the disease was of such a nature and had such symptoms, it would be difficult to ascertain whether it was stomatitis or foot and mouth disease without examination. Would you not have expected your departmental official to have made an instant examination with a view to ascertaining whether it was a serious disease, and a dangerous disease, or merely an innocuous one?—A. I expected that was being done.

Q. Yes, but it was only after the event that you found that there had been considerable delay? Let me put it this way: in the records which were brought down yesterday only in answer to a request for the production of all communications that passed between the veterinary officials, either provincial or federal, and the federal Department of Agriculture from the 17th of November, the only records produced—and they would be complete records—was one of December 28th from Dr. Christie to Dr. Childs, about the cattle in the Burns

packing plant; and on December 29, from Dr. Christie to Dr. Childs in which the question was asked what the source of infection was; and on January 4, 1952, from Dr. Childs to Dr. Christie that he is sending Dr. James' report; and then from January 4 until February 12 there is not one record of any communication having taken place either by the provincial or the dominion veterinarians with the department in Ottawa. Does not that delay from January 4 to February 12, without one communication, indicate that someone was not as careful as he should have been?—A. As I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, I received information about this disease possibly in the first days of February, and my information at that time was that active steps were being taken to diagnose the disease. There was apprehension at that time, although not very direct apprehension, that the disease might be foot and mouth.

Q. Now, that verbal communication that you had was with whom?—A. Mr. Young.

Q. Mr. Young; and did you keep a memorandum of the communication he made to you on that occasion; or, do you recollect what it was?—A. I did not keep a memorandum. Mr. Young merely reported to me that there were several cases of vesicular stomatitis at Regina, or in the neighbourhood of Regina; that a number of cases appeared to be getting more serious and more numerous; that the veterinary officials were concerned; that they were taking special steps to make sure of their diagnoses; that the evidence up to that time supported their earlier diagnoses, that the disease was vesicular stomatitis.

Q. He also told you that the diagnosis may have indicated that it may have been stomatitis?—A. That is my recollection.

Q. Is that correct?—A. That is the report, the verbal report I received.

Q. And did he say which of the veterinarians gave the report that it was in fact vesicular stomatitis?—A. No. The only veterinarians who made a report at that time as I recall it were those three; Dr. Childs, Dr. Christie and Dr. Carlton—that was the report from Dr. Christie.

Q. And Dr. Young told you that these three veterinarians were in agreement that it was stomatitis?—A. I would not be as specific as that. The report was general; and I think mention was probably also made of other officers who had made direct examination and had reached the same conclusion.

Q. Mention was made by Mr. Murray to the fact that there were veterinarians in the provincial government service. Were there any of these veterinarians of the provincial government service called in by the federal veterinarians to examine the situation and decide the action to be taken? To your knowledge?—A. Well, not to my personal knowledge. The reports I received in connection with this disease have been reported to them and there have been some consultations.

Q. When you say there, that is the report they made to Dr. Childs?—A. I have no personal knowledge of that.

Q. After you had this conversation with Dr. Young, how long after this was it that Dr. Young or anyone else reported to you that their first diagnosis was proven to be inaccurate, or suspected to be inaccurate, and that instant action would have to be taken?—A. I do not know that I can fix the date exactly as to the record, but my impression is, I think that Dr. Childs—it would be around the 15th of February.

Q. So that between the first time that Dr. Young made his first report on the 15th of February you heard nothing more from Dr. Childs, or anyone, that indicated the probability of its being other than stomatitis?—A. Except for the apprehension which had developed about the diagnosis.

Q. He expressed apprehension that it might be foot and mouth disease then for the first time, to your knowledge?—A. I think Mr. Young, he was the first man who discussed the matter with me; and, later on, of course, I did discuss it with Mr. Young and Dr. Childs together.

Q. So, on the first occasion Dr. Young brought the matter to your attention, did he say that he suspected the possibility that it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. It was on that occasion that he told me the symptoms were similar to those of foot and mouth and, therefore, there was some possibility.

Q. And did you suggest that they conduct a most careful examination, instantly, and immediately, without delay.—A. I asked whether that was the case and I was assured it was.

Q. And he told you that everything was being done that could be done?—A. That is my recollection.

Q. Did he tell you what had been done up to that time? Had he reported it to you?—A. In a general way; I was told of the earlier cases that had been reported and diagnosed; the results, at least, of the diagnoses—reported, quarantined and released.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Taggart a question. During the various stages of the development of this disease was there any request at any time, either by Dr. Neatby or Dr. Young, of taking any action in his official capacity; and, if so, what was the action asked for, and what action was taken by the deputy minister?—A. Dr. Neatby is not in this discussion at all. He was absent from Ottawa. Your point there, I take it, sir, is in connection with Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Neatby?

Q. Yes.—A. Dr. Neatby being absent any communications would be directly between Dr. Mitchell and myself, or Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Young; or between Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Childs, of course; therefore, your question is, did Dr. Young ask me to take any action which he himself was not able to take.

Q. Yes, which he did not have the authority to take.—A. I do not remember anything of that sort, in the earlier stages at any event; later on, as it came to applying ministerial orders and the like, of course, they were beyond the authority of the officers concerned and the orders were signed either by myself or by the minister or acting minister.

Q. Did you at any time refuse to act on their recommendations?—A. I have no recollection of that.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I have one other question I would like to ask about Dr. Childs. As I understand it now, the first consultation you had with Dr. Childs was in the early part of February, the first consultation you had with him?—A. Right.

Q. And that is the first intimation you had that there might be reasonable doubts, that foot and mouth disease might be present?—A. Yes.

Q. Who was it that advised you?—A. Dr. Young, first.

Q. He advised you to that effect?—A. Yes.

Q. Did Dr. Childs mention it?—A. He was present when the first report came in from Dr. Young over here.

Q. From Dr. Young verbally.—A. Dr. Childs was present at that time.

Q. That was the first time that you were actually in private consultation with Dr. Childs?—A. It would be a few days subsequent to Mr. Young's first verbal report. It might have been one or two days, a very brief period—within a week.

Q. Within the first week?—A. Yes.

Q. And then did Dr. Childs intimate to you that there might be some reasonable doubt, that it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. He said then, or shortly after, but the possibility was in the conversations.

Q. That was previous.—A. That was the reason why the matter was reported to me. If it had remained stomatitis I presume I would not have heard about it until I read the annual report.

Q. As I understand it that was previous to the 19th of February 1952?—
A. The matter of the doubt was transmitted to us.

Q. There was some doubt in your mind?—A. That is as far as I recollect it.

Q. Then, Mr. Taggart, may I ask you, would it not be naturally part of your job that a matter as important as this would be reported to you?—A. No.

Q. Did you not receive the weekly reports?—A. I do not receive any routine documents of that kind.

Q. Wasn't that strange, that you should not have received that information at an earlier date? Is it not strange that either Dr. Childs or someone else should have had occasion to consult with you, that it should not have been brought to your attention? By Dr. Neatby?—A. As I said, I did not know at the time I had my meeting with Mr. Young that Dr. Childs was away.

Q. You did not know that Dr. Childs was away from the office?—A. No, not so far. The matter came up in discussions later on but I did not know that he was away. I did not see the doctor. I do not ordinarily see the documents for people going on holidays.

Q. Were there any other veterinarians, either from Saskatchewan or from Ottawa, who got in touch with you at any time previous to your knowledge—previous to these samples being arranged to be sent down from Saskatchewan?—A. No. As I said, the first knowledge I had of stomatitis—vesicular stomatitis—was from Mr. Young in the early part of February; and I had no communication from anybody in Saskatchewan at that time that I can remember.

Q. You did not have any reports from any other veterinarian?—A. No, I did not.

Q. After having heard from Dr. Young that it might be foot and mouth disease you did not ask any other veterinarian at all?—A. No, not personally.

Q. Did you have some talk with Dr. Childs? When was that?—A. It was a few days later, I cannot give you the date exactly; but they admitted that perhaps it was the same thing. The actual meeting, Dr. Childs came in and I had a meeting.

Q. That was a few days after?—A. Yes, and I think Dr. Hall was present at that meeting; although, I am not sure of that.

Q. Well now, may I ask any additional veterinarians whom you have mentioned made any representations to anybody that this was not foot and mouth disease, that it was merely stomatitis?—A. I don't remember any representations of that sort, coming to me directly.

Q. At any time previous was there any doubts that it was actually foot and mouth disease at this time—official evidence and so on?—A. There was doubt of some kind.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. There is just one other question I want to ask in regard to this, now that the deputy minister is here. A lot of this work was being done in the field by the officers of your department, investigation was being made; when anything of that kind is taking place is it not customary, when reports are being made—they, knowing what is taking place—is it not customary that reports are made regarding these investigations by these people to their departments through the senior officers of the department to the administrative head?—A. Yes, that is the practise; but it would depend on the nature of the work.

Q. Take in the division of Animal Diseases on a matter as important as this and an investigation being made, would you not expect that the reports would be made to the departmental heads from time to time as to what was taking place?—A. The routine is that the district veterinary reports to the veterinary director general weekly, I believe.

Q. I see, and that would be Dr. Christie?—A. Dr. Christie and Dr. Childs.

Q. Dr. Christie and?—A. Dr. Christie and Dr. Childs; or Dr. Christie, one of them. Dr. Christie is the head of the Regina division.

Q. No, the reason I am asking you that is this. You mentioned, very fairly mentioned that as time went on and the disease became more general and other cases were springing up. Would you not have expected Dr. Christie to have reported to Dr. Childs in this weekly report what he was finding, what was taking place—the extension of the disease, its extension and so on?—A. Yes.

Q. And that would be the reason for bringing this to your attention. Now, from January 4, 1952, until February 12, there is no report whatsoever. Doesn't that strike you as being most strange?—A. There should be reports, I think they are sent in weekly, weekly reports from Dr. Christie.

Q. Well, the request I made was this, for a copy of all communications that passed between the veterinary officials, either provincial or federal, and the federal Department of Agriculture; and the return that I got shows that there is not one communication between January 4 and February 12. If the return is correct would you not regard that as a rather serious dereliction of duty on the part of those investigating this matter?—A. There should be the routine weekly reports.

Q. And if there are no such reports do you regard that as concrete evidence that somebody was not discharging his responsibility?—A. I would like you to ask Dr. Childs that question about the weekly reports. I have no personal knowledge of that because I do not see them.

Q. And would you not also expect on the records some letters or communications from Dr. Childs, in charge of this branch, advising these officials in Regina of the seriousness of the situation should they be mistaken in their diagnosis?—A. Yes, I should think so, unless it would be that during that particular period of time they regarded the disease as having come under control. As I recall it, the spread and the increase in seriousness of the trouble became evident along in February, about the second week in February, I should think.

Q. There were no extensions of the field of the disease during January?—A. As I recall it, a number of the quarantines were lifted in mid-January on the assumption that the disease was under control.

Q. I would just bring one matter to your attention and then I am through. I now come to a telegram, which I shall read, and then I will ask you about it. It is dated February 15, 1952, and addressed to Dr. Christie, 2827 Regina Avenue, Regina:

Understand Dr. Hall in collaboration with Dr. Mitchell has issued instructions for collection and forwarding to laboratory, Hull, material from animals suffering from infectious vesicular condition. Those instructions definitely countermanded. Definite diagnosis must be made on premises where disease exists. Understand another horse has been inoculated. Hold quarantines tight and await results horse inoculations. Self on statutory leave when instructions collect material for laboratory examination issued by Doctor Hall. Wire acknowledgement immediately

T. Childs, Veterinary Director General

Now, Dr. Hall and Dr. Mitchell were the veterinarians in the field, were they not?—A. Dr. Hall would be acting in Dr. Childs' absence.

Q. And he would be in Regina at that time?—A. Dr. Hall would be in Ottawa acting in place of Dr. Childs.

Q. And Dr. Mitchell would be in the field?—A. He is head of the Animal Pathology laboratory in Hull and would be at Hull, or elsewhere, on duty at that time, but not in Regina.

Q. Not at Regina?—A. Not necessarily at Regina. He would not necessarily be at Regina.

Q. And during the absence of Dr. Christie on vacation Dr. Hall would be in charge?—A. Excuse me, Dr. Childs on vacation, Dr. Hall would be in charge of the division, correct.

Q. And you will agree, now, will you not, that Dr. Hall's instructions that he should take laboratory samples was a good idea, having regard to the danger of this disease being more serious than an examination would indicate, an ordinary examination?—A. I would like you to have Dr. Childs express views on that from a professional point of view, Mr. Chairman, because it is hardly within my field to determine the method of diagnosis of disease.

Q. But then wouldn't you expect as deputy minister in a matter as serious as this that some time between January 4 and February 12 indications would be made to you in writing setting forth the seriousness and the potentialities of this disease, and the possibility of this disease being more than stomatitis?—A. No, I wouldn't in view of the fact that Dr. Hall and Dr. Young were both in the same building and could see me daily, and most of the discussions on a matter of that sort would be verbal.

Q. I have just one other question. Have you known of other cases where the orders made by one incumbent of the senior position have been countermanded by the official head on his return following vacation? Have you ever known of countermanding orders made by one official in this department by the other?—A. I do not recall any at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COTE: In sequence to questions put by my honourable friend, I would like to ask the witness one question, as to whether it is the government's responsibility, or whether it is a civil servant's responsibility, and I want to put the guy on the spot who is responsible. Now, if he thinks that there is another than himself, I would like to know; I would like to know the goat.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Taggart considers he cannot answer your question, Mr. Cote.

Mr. COTE: If he does not answer, I would like somebody to answer because after all, as I said before, there was an article published in a very highly publicized paper saying who was wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. COTE: Now, I do not think the minister is responsible. I do not think the government is responsible. I think civil servants are responsible. I would like to know who, and I would like to see him fired.

The CHAIRMAN: That Mr. Cote, is the business of the committee.

Mr. COTE: That is why I am asking the chairman of the committee to inform me.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Taggart, first, who has the responsibility and authority to impose a quarantine on the outbreak of a contagious disease.—A. That question, I think, could be more clearly answered by Dr. Childs, who administers that Act. There are powers in the Act and regulations which may be exercised by an inspector in the field, other powers by the veterinary director general, and still other powers by the minister or Governor in Council. The veterinary director general has, of course, broad powers to take quick action to quarantine or control, but the type of quarantine that was finally imposed at Regina on an area, I think, can be made only on the authority of the minister. In fact, I believe that at that time the first quarantine order applying to the whole area was applied by an order in council. The veterinary director general can, and does, or his officers can and do apply quarantines to individual premises.

Q. Well, the first quarantine which was applied, and I presume that was to individual premises in December, I believe it was, by whom was that

applied?—A. That would be applied by the officer on the ground on authority of the veterinary director general.

Q. And has that same officer the authority to lift that quarantine, or who has the authority to lift a quarantine once it is imposed—A. I am not sure, but if you would ask Dr. Childs he could tell you. I think technically the authority would rest with the veterinary director general and his officer would act on his instructions or would recommend action which would be sanctioned by the veterinary director general.

Q. When a quarantine is imposed by a local officer, is there any regulation requiring that that be reported to headquarters here in Ottawa, and to whom is it reported, and to whom should it be reported?—A. It would be reported—that is a routine matter—it would be reported in the routine weekly report. Dr. Childs could give you that information in detail.

Q. Was the report of this first quarantine—I believe it was on Burns' plant—reported to you?—A. Not to me personally. It came to Ottawa but not to my office.

Mr. MACLEAN (*Queens*): I would like to ask one question. Is there any system by which the department is kept informed of the progress of dangerous contagious animal diseases in other countries?

The WITNESS: Yes, Dr. Childs can give you information on the details as to exchange of information and reporting among the countries. There are various agreements and arrangements in existence. I cannot give you the details of those, but Dr. Childs, I am sure, can.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. When was the first written report that Mr. Taggart received about foot and mouth disease being definitely established? I think it was around February 14. Is that in writing? Have you a copy of that report or letter?—A. No, I think that there was no definite confirmation of foot and mouth as early as the 14th February. It would be perhaps even a week later than that.

Q. Have you that in writing?—A. I have not a written report by me.

Q. Can you bring it here?—A. Any reports there are can be produced.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that that be produced.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions of Mr. Taggart?

Mr. ROSS: I would like to ask Mr. Taggart if any reports reached him concerning the activities of private veterinarians on this original outbreak? The statement was made in the House of Commons, for instance, that seven veterinarians in private practice had all decided that this was not foot and mouth disease for some time. Would you have any reports from these private veterinarians at all?

The WITNESS: None to my office directly. Those reports would come in the routine way from the field to Dr. Christie, or to his office, and to Dr. Childs. They would not come in the normal course to my office.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. How did the Americans happen to send up their Dr. Shahan?—A. When we first reported our suspicions to the United States we asked them, at the same time, to send an observer so that they would be able to examine the situation and know what we were doing and be able to reach a conclusion as to what the disease was.

Q. Did that letter go from you to the United States authorities?—A. The first communications were between Dr. Childs and Dr. Simms of the United States department. I think they were first by telephone. Dr. Childs can

confirm that. Then by telegraph. Mr. first communication to the United States government was through External Affairs on, I think, the 18th February.

Q. And on that date did you then know that it was foot and mouth disease?—A. No, we did not know, but we were definitely afraid of it by that time.

Q. On what date did you become afraid that it was foot and mouth disease, for the first time?—A. I think we were finally certain of it on the 23rd or 24th.

Q. At what time did you become afraid?—A. At the time we sent that message to the United States, I was very much afraid and that fear arose because of reports coming to me by Dr. Childs, Dr. Young and Dr. Hall.

Q. What caused you to arrive at that fear? There had been no clinical examinations, had there, at that time? There had been no results of the research examinations in Hull? What was it that suddenly caused you to fear?—A. The reports from the officers concerned.

Q. Those reports we do not have here. What is the nature of those reports that gave support to the fears that this was, in fact, foot and mouth disease?—A. Well, during that period, as I said, I had frequent personal and telephone conversations with Mr. Young, Dr. Childs when he was there, and Dr. Hall when Dr. Childs was not there, and the tenor of their reports from day to day was that the disease was taking on a more serious aspect and they were more concerned it might be foot and mouth disease.

Q. And the day you found it was foot and mouth disease was?—A. My recollection is that it was the 23rd or 24th February that it was confirmed.

Q. I see in the return tabled in the House yesterday that there was a radio speech made on Sunday, February 24, and I do not see anything in there to indicate that it is other than stomatitis. It says:

Much has been written in the past few days respecting the outbreak of stomatitis.

Following the first reports of the disease to veterinary officers of the Health of Animals division preliminary investigations were carried out to ascertain the extent and potential of the disease.

These preliminary investigations indicated the necessity of quarantine measures as a means of limiting the spread of the disease.

That radio speech was apparently given before it was known the disease was in fact foot and mouth disease?—A. I think the thing was officially confirmed on the 24th.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Diefenbaker, may I ask whose radio speech that was?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This is one that remains incognito.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Where did it come from?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is from the department and it says on page 32 of the return, under date of 25th of February, "Attached hereto is list of shipment of meats . . ." and so on and then there is a radio speech delivered over station CKCK Regina on Sunday the 24th, included in the return, but the paternity is not given.

Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Is there not a letter there?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I just got this return and it says: Attached is a copy of a radio speech delivered over CKCK, Regina, Sunday, February 24th and the copy is signed by K. Wells.

Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He is the one.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: He delivered it.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. As a result of the recent outbreak what areas have been added to the quarantine area in Saskatchewan?—A. The most recent one?

Q. Yes?—A. I do not think that has been finally determined. If it has been it is only this morning and perhaps Dr. Childs can give you a definition of the new area.

Q. What action was taken by the department in the buffer zone in regard to cattle in that zone being placed in community pastures?—A. The decision respecting community pastures was made I think on the ground between Dr. Christie and Dr. Wells on the one hand and Mr. Thompson, director of the P.F.R.A. on the other—as to the opening and stocking of community pastures.

Q. Stock was taken from the buffer zone and placed in community pastures?—A. There was movement of stock within the buffer zone.

Q. There would not be, of course, any movement of stock from the quarantine zone into the community pastures?—A. No, and I think no movement of stock from the buffer zone to outside.

Q. The community pastures would be stocked with cattle from within the buffer zone?—A. Yes, and of course community pastures outside the buffer zone would be stocked in the normal way in the spring.

Q. The second last outbreak, as reported to the press, was caused by a certain animal that was shipped from some place within the quarantine zone or in the buffer zone to the meat packing house. Where did that animal originate? What date was it shipped out?—A. I do not know.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. In connection with what has been read into the record by Mr. Diefenbaker, the telegram of February 15, Dr. Childs the veterinary director general did go out to Regina immediately following that?—A. Yes, and Dr. Childs can give you his own itinerary there.

Q. Within three days, that is February 18, he wired your department and it is on record as follows:

Clinical evidence amply justifies quarantine livestock rural municipalities indicated below for suspected infectious and contagious disease. Ministerial order should be issued immediately establishing quarantine prohibiting movement of livestock out of and into quarantined municipalities except through shipments proceeding by rail which must not be unloaded within quarantine municipalities. Rural municipalities south Qu'Appelle No. 157 Edenwold 158 Sherwood 159 Pense 160 Lumsden 189 North Qu'Appelle 187 that portion only south of the Qu'Appelle waters. Will telephone about eleven a.m. Monday.

T. CHILDS.

That was sent from Regina?—A. That would come to Dr. Young.

Q. Yes, and it is three days after his other wire that Dr. Childs was out there?

Mr. MacKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, according to press reports the disease was first diagnosed as a contagious disease and quarantine set up. Is it true that the cattle apparently all recovered, that none died, and that the quarantine was lifted?

The WITNESS: That is the report, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWNE: You mean the official report or the press report?

The WITNESS: The official report to the veterinarian director general.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. From whom? From the Department, the Saskatchewan government or from the officials of your department? When it is official that must be known?—A. The report would come from the official in Regina to the official in Ottawa.

Q. From whom?—A. Dr. Christie or some member of his staff, to Dr. Childs.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. COTE: Crucify those guys, that is all.

By Mr. White:

Q. Reference has been made to the shipment of meat from the Burns plant. Who directly has charge of following that up. Is that under you, Mr. Taggart?—A. Shipment of meat from an inspected packing plant?

Q. No, from the Burns plant?—A. That would come under the control of Dr. Childs or under his officials down the line in the division of the meat inspection service. They would issue the necessary certificates to move that meat if it were moved interprovincially.

Q. I understand shipments were made to western Ontario. There are records that either confirm or deny that?—A. Inspection record? I think so. I think there would be meat inspection records. It is a question you will have to ask another authority—whether those inspection records show, but I think they do and I think they must show the destination of the shipment out of inspected plants.

Q. Were any instructions sent to veterinarians or the different distributors of this meat that there were possibilities of infection if any of the offal were exposed?—A. I have no knowledge of any special instructions accompanying meat shipments. You are referring to the shipments from the Burns plant in Regina, specifically?

Q. Yes and I understand, although I have not the evidence to prove it but it is on pretty good authority, that some went to Windsor, Ontario, and some to Walkerville, Ontario.—A. During the time there was no quarantine or no special restrictions on the plant that could be true, of course.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I wonder if the deputy minister could tell the committee whether he had any discussions at any time in February with any of the officials connected with the Hull laboratory?—A. Oh, yes, I talked to Dr. Mitchell and other members of the staff.

Q. About what date would you first talk to Dr. Mitchell or any other member of his staff?—A. I should think my conversation with Dr. Mitchell would be mainly or perhaps wholly after the 10th of February and between that and the 25th of February.

Q. Can you recollect whether you had any conversation with Dr. Mitchell or any other officials on say the 10th, 11th, or 12th, or somewhere in or about that date?—A. I cannot from my personal knowledge nail the conversation to a particular date, but I do remember definitely discussing the thing with Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Childs on the 24th of February when they had reached their final conclusion.

Q. In your earlier discussion with Dr. Mitchell did any discussion take place as to what tests should be made on those animals? I do not know what other discussion you might have had with them but I would think, myself, that would be a most important point and it would very likely have been discussed?—A. Those matters would most likely be discussed between Dr. Hall, Dr. Childs, Dr. Mitchell or the members of the staff of their division. They are technical matters which would not normally be discussed by my office.

Q. Are you telling the committee in your earlier conversation with Dr. Mitchell that he did not discuss with you or he did not raise the question of whether tests should possibly be made at the Hull laboratory—that he did not make any suggestions to that effect?—A. My first clear recollection of discussion of this particular thing with Dr. Mitchell would be at the time or subsequent to the time when Dr. Mitchell's lab undertook to make these tests.

Q. Did Dr. Mitchell at any time discuss with you any differences of opinion amongst officials as to what kind of tests should be made?—A. No.

Q. Dr. Mitchell never suggested to you that he had any difficulty in getting lab tests made at the laboratory in Hull?—A. No difficulty on that score that I ever heard of.

Q. Any discussion with him as to the contents of the telegram that has been referred to this morning?—A. No.

Q. Well in this return that was tabled yesterday, and it was already on record earlier in answer to questions of mine, on December 28th or December 29th there were 30 head of cattle suffering with a disease in the Burns feed lot—out of 137 steers and 70 heifers. I wonder if you could tell the committee what was done at the Burns plant between that date and any subsequent lifting of the quarantine or, shall we say, up until early February? What was done there because there were 30 head with stomatitis? What happened to the 30 head?—A. I think that information is on the record and it can be repeated to the committee. I am not able to give it verbally here.

Q. What happened to the carcasses of the 30 head that were suffering from stomatitis?—A. As I say that is information that I cannot give you from my knowledge but it is on the record and can be made available—if it has not been made available previously.

Q. You do not know when those cattle were killed and what disposition was made of the carcasses, or about the situation at the Burns plant?—A. I cannot give you from personal knowledge out of hand the details of what happened; but I do say that they can be produced, and if they have not already been given to the committee, they certainly can be given.

Q. With so many animals sick at the Burns plant, and with the subsequent serious consequences of the disease, I think the deputy minister should have a pretty good idea of what was done at the Burns plant. It seems to me that one of the important things in this whole discussion is what was done to see that the disease did not spread from that 30 head of cattle—not one head, or two heads, or three heads, but 30 heads—of sick animals in the Burns plant in December.—A. I am sure if you ask Dr. Childs, he will give you that information, and I am sure that the records can be produced. Of course, I am not in a position to give it to you from memory.

Q. It has been suggested in the House, and on the radio this morning, that the most recent outbreak of foot and mouth disease near Weyburn is the most serious outbreak so far to date, and it may have the most serious consequences; and the impression I got from listening to the radio report was that instead of the situation improving, it is becoming more serious and that it may be a long time before the disease is finally cleared up. I wonder if the deputy minister could give us some statement as to his own opinion about the seriousness of the present, most serious, outbreak and of the stage we are at now in dealing with this particular disease?—A. Based on the report you have received, for the moment, this most recent case which is northeast of Weyburn is serious, in that some of the animals from that farm were transferred to a pasture a few days prior to the disease being diagnosed.

Q. They were transferred to a P.F.R.A. pasture?—A. Yes; and there are some hundreds of animals in that pasture and it is possible there may be quite a destruction there because of that fact.

Q. Is it right, according to the report, that there is somewhere in the neighborhood of one thousand head of cattle in that particular community pasture?—A. Around 900 head of cattle in that pasture, according to the report.

Q. Around 900 head of cattle in that pasture according to the report; is it the opinion of the minister that the disease at the present time is far more serious and that the possible consequences of this disease are far more serious than anybody has realized up to the present date?—A. The seriousness of this case arises

from the fact that these cattle were put into the pasture prior to the disease being diagnosed on this particular farm.

Q. Has it been reported to the minister what the source of infection was?—A. The last available reports do not give any clear indication of what the possible source of infection was.

Mr. CATHERWOOD: Is this community pasture very far outside the buffer zone?

The WITNESS: It is within the buffer zone.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. In the giving of reports from one official to another you have traced the routine. Do any of these departmental heads, such as the head of the Animal Diseases branch, report direct to the Minister of Agriculture or to you?—A. The normal routine is for the veterinary director-general to report to the director of production services, and he in turn would report to the deputy. It is a common thing in verbal discussions to bring in two or three people down the line.

Q. And when did you first report to the Minister of Agriculture about the situation in regard to the disease, whether it was suspected to be stomatitis or foot and mouth disease? When was the first report that you gave him in regard to the situation?—A. You mean to Mr. Gardiner?

Q. Yes.—A. I think it was on the 18th of February when I first reported to him.

Q. And up until the 18th of February he had no reports from you regarding the existence of any disease, stomatitis or otherwise, existing in this Regina area?—A. I think that is correct.

Q. And at the time you reported to Mr. Gardiner, was it true that he was away on vacation?—A. He was in the west, at the west coast, I think.

Q. You say he was in the west, or at the west coast; so, until that date there had been no communication whatever with Mr. Gardiner by you on behalf of the department regarding this matter?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. I wonder if the deputy minister would answer this question: has it now been established that there was only one disease, or were there two diseases? In other words, this stomatitis that you speak of, or ordinary stomatitis, and foot and mouth disease?—A. That is a technical question and I am afraid that I cannot answer it. A professional opinion on that point would not be of much value from me.

Q. What efforts have been made to trace the source of this disease?—A. Oh, a great many lines of inquiry have been followed; but the exact details as to what those lines were would have to be explained by the veterinaries or the others who made the investigations. But the people on whose premises the disease was found would be questioned carefully over a period of time to try to find out the possible source of contamination, such as persons, animals and traffic that may have carried the disease; transfers of property that may have carried the disease would be checked. There are questions which we ask to try to disclose possible transfers; imports of products that might have carried the virus of the disease would be checked with the customs people at Regina, and some of the ports of landing of shipments going to Regina. Every avenue which appeared likely to yield any information as to the possible source would be checked in the same way as a police investigation would check possible clues to a crime.

Q. And it is still a mystery?—A. There is no proof that I know of as to the exact origin or source of the infection.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. I would like to ask the deputy minister about the test which was made on the German immigrant who worked at the first place where the outbreak was. As I read the press reports, I think they were misleading. I took the finding to be that this chap could not have brought the virus to this country; and I think that all the tests proved was that there was no virus found on his clothing or person at that time. But is it fair to say that those tests did not prove whether or not he might have brought the virus to that farm? Is that right?—A. You might ask Mr. Mitchell that question when he appears; but my memory is that Dr. Mitchell reported that he was unable to find the virus on Willie, or on his effects.

Q. But it in no way proved that he did not bring it out. He might have brought it, and the virus have disappeared before the tests?—A. That is possible. I presume that the time during which the virus might live in a different set of conditions would be a question of technical opinion which Dr. Mitchell might answer.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. What is the opinion about the inception of the latest outbreak?—A. We have no clue which looks good enough to accept as a probability.

Q. Is there any water course in Regina coming from that direction at all? There is none that I know of?—A. No.

Q. Any transfers or movements of cattle from around the Regina area down to this area?—A. There have been no transfers from the Regina area to this area. I think I am right in saying that the continuous quarantine would stop the movement of Regina cattle from going southward.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Dr. Taggart, up until now in the official records which I have seen, there has been no admission that the Waas herd was infected with foot and mouth disease. Is that true?—A. Would you be willing to ask Dr. Childs and Dr. Mitchell questions on that? It is a technical question which I perhaps should not attempt to answer.

Q. After all, Dr. Taggart, anyone in the department should know whether it has now been supposed that the disease, that it was foot and mouth disease or not that was in the Waas herd.—A. The presumption is that it was foot and mouth disease; but if you want to get technical answers to your questions, I would suggest that Dr. Childs and Dr. Mitchell be asked to give them.

Q. I have had a question on the Order Paper, and any question answered so far has never admitted that it is foot and mouth disease. I understand that the herd was challenged, that the Waas herd was challenged before it was shot on the 14th of March, but the last answer I have had to the question just referred to is that the tests were not completed yet, nevertheless cattle were shot on the 14th of March.—A. Dr. Mitchell can give you the information. My information was that there was an experimental project undertaken with those cattle, and that blood samples were taken; and Dr. Mitchell I am sure can report on the results of that check.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. I would like to follow up the question which Mr. Diefenbaker asked a short time ago. I think, Dr. Taggart, you said that the first report of this matter which you made to Mr. Gardiner was on the 18th, when he was at the west coast?—A. That is right.

Q. Did you report it prior to that time to the acting minister of agriculture in Ottawa? I presume there was an acting minister of agriculture here at that time?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. When did you report it to the acting minister of agriculture?—A. I cannot fix a day; it would be some days before the report to the minister.

Q. Who was the acting minister of agriculture at that time?—A. Mr. Winters.

Q. You say it would be some days before; would you indicate whether it would be a week?—A. I am sorry.

Q. Would you indicate? You said it would be some days before; so would you indicate whether it would be a week, or more or less?—A. I was in daily communication with the acting minister by telephone and by personal contact for quite a number of days; I would say four or five days or perhaps a week; and most of those communications would be verbal reporting.

Q. You say it would be four or five days or a week possibly?—A. Certainly some days.

Q. Before the 18th?—A. It might be prior to that.

Q. And did he take any action as a result of your report?—A. No; I do not think there was any action required of the minister at that moment. Any information we gave him was for the sake of information and not for action, as I recall it, up until the time the Order in Council was required to establish the quarantine area.

Q. That was on the 24th?—A. That was the inclusive Order in Council for the quarantine.

Q. So there was no ministerial action until the quarantine order on the 24th or the 25th, when it was put into effect?—A. Pardon me; I think that the quarantine area was established before that; it would be the 19th or the 20th.

Q. You say the 19th or the 20th; that was the first ministerial action which was taken?—A. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Bryce.

Mr. BRYCE: I wonder if Dr. Taggart would tell the committee about the animals that were in the Burns packing plant? There were 30 sick, and we said we would ask some other body what happened to them. But what happened to the ones which were not sick? Were they distributed over the country, or did they go to be slaughtered? What happened to those animals which were in contact with the sick animals?—A. I think that information has been given and is on the record. I have not got it by me; but if it is required, it can be produced. Dr. Childs could tell us immediately if you want him to do so; I have not got in my mind the exact disposition of the animals that were in that yard.

Mr. ARGUE: They went through the processing plant.

The WITNESS: The majority of them, I think, were killed and buried, and compensation was paid for them.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you through, Mr. Bryce?

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. I am anxious to know if they were all killed, or if some of them went back into somebody else's feed lots, carrying the infection.—A. Just as a general statement, all animals that moved out from that area or plant, or general vicinity, between the 1st of November and the time the official quarantine was applied—every farm to which they were taken was examined and checked carefully. All the remaining animals in there were either slaughtered in the plant or slaughtered and compensation paid for them as being animals in contact with the disease.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Mr. Taggart, don't you think that Canadians as a whole are interested in finding out, once the disease is under control, when the United States embargo may be expected to be removed; and that your department should get in touch with the United States government in that connection? Isn't that so?—A. Yes. We have had conversations with them.

Q. Yes, you have had conversations with them; and if it had not been for this latest outbreak might it have been expected that the embargo would have been lifted?—A. That question can't be answered categorically, Mr. Chairman.

Q. I appreciate that, but you can give us a reasonable indication, a reasonable general answer to it.—A. As I stated, the U.S. regulations provide a minimum time which much elapse after the United States authorities are satisfied that we are free from the disease before they lift their embargo. That is 60 days.

Q. And how many officials have the United States now present in the Regina area, veterinarians and the like?—A. They have had different veterinarians, and I think there is one stationed in Regina from the U.S. department now, but whether there are more than that I am not in position to say.

Q. At one time, if I remember correctly, there were 6 American United States veterinarians in the area.—A. I do not think—I am not sure, again—I do not think there were 6 at any one time. They would send a man up and recall him and send another one up. I am not sure of the exact number or sequence.

Q. Now, in these informal talks you have had with the American officials have you been assured that within 60 days after the disease is eradicated that the American embargo would be lifted?—A. No, no; we have had no such assurance.

Q. Nothing like that?—A. No.

Q. In other words, they would not do that?—A. No.

Q. They have not committed themselves one way or another?—A. No, but I might say that they have at all times been most cooperative and helpful.

Q. But not definite?—A. No, nothing definite in that regard.

By Mr. White:

Q. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the minister, the Honourable Mr. Winters was acting minister of agriculture; was he informed of the developments? Or the parliamentary assistant to the minister. Was he also advised at that time? Then I have another question to ask.—A. I don't remember clearly, Mr. Chairman, whether the parliamentary assistant to the minister was in Ottawa during that time that Mr. Winter was being informed of developments. I cannot answer that question categorically. I should think, or I am inclined to think that Mr. McCubbin was not in Ottawa at that time. I do not remember having discussed the matter with him, in the early stages anyway.

Q. It was naturally to be expected, though, that he would know about it?—A. Well, if he were here he would probably hear, but if he were not here he probably would not; because at that time, in the early stages of this thing, we were not reporting more than we had to, we were not using the word foot and mouth during the early stages because we had some reason to believe that it was not foot and mouth and we didn't want to scatter that word around.

Q. To change the subject entirely, going back to the distribution of meat from the Burn's plant; are there any officials outside of the Veterinary Director General's branch, any officials of the Burn's plant who will know anything about this?—A. The records of inspections are all made out at the plant and they would be in the hands of the meat inspection section of the Veterinary Director General's division.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Mr. Taggart, have you any knowledge when or if the embargo in connection with cattle going into the United States from Mexico, as a result of foot and mouth disease—if the embargo there has been lifted or not?—A. Some

two months ago the United States government announced that if there were no further outbreaks of foot and mouth disease in Mexico the embargo against Mexican cattle and meat would be lifted on September 1, 1952. Now, I think there might have been some limitation to that announcement.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the fact that the embargo might be lifted against cattle going out of certain portions of Mexico before the embargo against the whole of the country would be removed?—A. I am not sure. I am merely giving hearsay evidence, and it is not very good; but my memory is—we could get all the U. S. documents if the committee would like to have them—that they announced, I think, an unconditional removal of the embargo as from September 1st.

Q. The reason I asked you that question was to find out whether it might be possible to have the embargo lifted, the emergency embargo lifted on a part of a country—let us say to have it lifted against eastern Canada while it remains in effect as against western Canada. Has any approach of that kind been made to the American government?—A. In the informal discussions I think it was suggested. As I answered a moment ago, the U. S. people have given no undertaking, and they are not in a position to make any commitments at this time.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. The waiting period apparently in the United States for lifting the Mexican embargo is not 60 days; is it somewhere in the neighbourhood of 6 months?—A. Well, I think I explained that, Mr. Chairman.

Q. So that if we get no better treatment it will be 6 months after our disease is cleaned up before we can get that release.—A. As I explained, Mr. Chairman, the U. S. regulations say a minimum of 60 days must elapse after the country is declared to be free of the disease.

Q. And that in effect means 6 months.—A. Well, for possibly longer than the minimum period indicated.

Q. That is right?—A. Yes.

Q. I would like now to turn to another aspect of this question which I think perhaps is more prominent in the minds of cattle producers throughout Canada generally than who may or may not have fallen down on the job. I refer to the whole question of floor prices. Floor prices have been announced, but from the information I have been receiving, certainly in the press, those floor prices are not being followed. For example, there is this report in the *Montreal Gazette* of yesterday, that floor prices—at Saskatchewan for good steers, the floor was to be \$22.80 per hundred weight—have fallen as low as \$17 and \$18 a hundred. I would like to know what the explanation is, what explanation there is for such a reduction so far below the floor; or, for that matter, completely below the floor. Whether this is one sided or whether it prevails in other provinces. And, particularly, I would like to know what steps the Department of Agriculture are taking to see that floor prices on meat are in fact paid to the producers and are enforced?—A. Mr. Chairman, I did not come prepared to discuss floor prices. I thought the foot and mouth disease problem was under discussion, and the question raises a whole range of policy and administrative problems which I feel unable to deal with at the moment.

Q. As I understand our terms of reference they extend to any ramifications of foot and mouth disease and in my opinion this is a very important if not the most important ramification as it applies to cattle producers in all Canada. With great respect to the deputy minister, I think that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture with his knowledge of the department is quite capable of giving the committee some explanation; and, certainly, I am sure that he knows what steps if any the government or the department are taking to see that these

floor prices are imposed.—A. Mr. Chairman, if that question is to be answered I would like very much to have the privilege of bringing Mr. Shaw, chairman of the Agriculture Prices Support Board, before the committee.

Q. If that is agreeable.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. I would like to ask a question about the Mexican outbreak. Can Mr. Taggart tell us if any special action was taken following that outbreak and also the outbreak in Europe and the United Kingdom with respect to defensive measures against the disease coming to Canada?—A. I think Dr. Childs would be better able to answer that question. There are many consultations between our officers and the Health of Animals people in the United States, and consultations also with the veterinary authorities in Great Britain.

Q. That would suggest, then, that the department was alerted to the possibility of the outbreak of the disease in Canada?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Mr. Chairman, when Dr. Taggart was giving us information about the organization of his department he said that he had not dealt with the other departmental services. I was going to ask him to do that, in a general way. Our discussions are more directly related to the Health of Animals branch, but I do hope that at some convenient time Dr. Taggart will give us the organization of all the departmental services, and then have his officials here. I think he ought to do that with respect to the marketing division, particularly following the statement made by the minister that these floor prices did not prevail. There have been some very serious difficulties with respect to the marketing of beef, particularly at the stockyards at Manitoba. Those people have issued a statement there that they could not give the price, purchase cattle at these floor prices, unless the federal government guarantees them against financial loss. That may, or may not be the case, but that is a public statement by the commission people in Winnipeg, and this does affect the price of beef in this country to a great extent. I do hope, without interfering with the Health of Animals discussion here, that we can get Dr. Shaw here before he leaves.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, if I might occupy the rest of the time, there are a few documents which I have before me to which I would like to refer. On December 28th, Dr. Christie wired regarding the report of Dr. James. Here is Dr. James' report by mail to him on the 6th of December, 1952. Now, on January 4th, Dr. Childs wired to Dr. Christie: "Waiting Dr. James report particularly stomatitis Burns feed lot Regina reported wire December 28. Long delay not understood. Please expedite repeat please expedite", and that is signed by Dr. Childs, veterinary director general. There is nothing to indicate that Dr. James reported at all. It is not in the records, and I would like to have that report because it is apparently missing inadvertently from the return.—A. That is the report from Dr. Christie?

Q. From Dr. James, Dr. James' report.—A. From Dr. James to Dr. Christie.

Q. Apparently, yes; because you will notice on January 4, Dr. Childs said—"repeat please expedite": I would like to see that report from Dr. James because it might clarify some of the investigation that took place.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is nearly 1 o'clock Mr. Chairman, but earlier you indicated that at the latter end of the meeting we would discuss the witnesses to be called. Do you want to decide on that now, or do you want to leave that to the steering committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn I was to announce the membership of the steering committee, but I wish you would just stay for a moment or two and perhaps this could be discussed.

I do not know whether there are any more questions for Mr. Taggart now that he is here. Are we through with the questions?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have some questions arising out of the James report.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Taggart has just announced it would assist them very much if we could have the Health of Animals division witnesses in first so that they could come and give their evidence and then get back to their work.

I see now that it is one o'clock and before asking someone to move that we adjourn I will announce the membership of the steering committee.

Mr. Ross: What about the next meeting?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that will have to be subject to the call of the chair because we have to get permission from the House to sit while the House is sitting, and that has not been done yet.

Here is the composition of the steering committee: Messrs. A. C. Stewart (Yorkton), Laing, Hetland, McCubbin, McLean (Huron-Perth), Charlton, Ross (Souris), Quelch and Argue, along with myself.

Would someone move that we adjourn subject to the call of the chair.

It is moved by Mr. Diefenbaker that we adjourn.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order please, gentlemen. I think it would be in order to have a motion and I would suggest that the committee print from day to day 1,000 copies in English and 200 in French of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan.

Carried.

And now, I have here in my hand the sessional paper that was laid on the table of the House yesterday by the minister; and, if someone would move, I think we could have copies of these papers printed so that every member of the committee could have a copy.

Mr. KICKHAM: I would so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Kickham, seconded by Mr. Charlton that this sessional paper appear as an appendix to today's report of our Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence.

Carried.

When we adjourned at 1 o'clock Mr. Taggart was still in the chair. Are there any other questions for Mr. Taggart?

Mr. STEWART: Just before you proceed, Mr. Chairman, some reference was made to the fact that there was no element of provincial responsibility in connection with this matter. For the benefit of the committee I should like to read into the record—I will just cite the section numbers—but I would suggest that these sections be incorporated in our report of Proceedings and Evidence.

There is a responsibility on the province as well as the federal government and I will refer you to the Contagious Diseases Animals Act, being chapter 70, of the revised statutes of Saskatchewan, 1949; and I refer you to sections 2, 3, 4 and 9 particularly of that statute. I will not take the time to read them now but they will be typed in our Minutes of Proceedings. I will refer you also to the Stock Inspection Act, being chapter 18 of the revised statutes of Saskatchewan, 1940; and particularly having regard to sections 3, 4, 5 and also the sections 7, 8, 9 and 10 of that statute, and the members of the committee can see what responsibility is on the provincial government.

"2. In this Act the expression:

1. "animal" means any horse, sheep, goat, swine or poultry and any animal of the bovine species by whatever technical or familiar name known;

2. "brucellosis," commonly known as Bang's disease, means the disease wherein any animal is infected with the *Brucella abortus* (Bang's bacillus) irrespective of the occurrence or absence of an abortion;

3. "contagious" means communicable by close contact or inoculation;

4. "disease" means any infectious or contagious disease;

5. "infectious" means communicable in any manner;

6. "inspector" means any inspector employed in the department of Agriculture and any veterinary surgeon licensed under The Veterinary Association Act;

7. "minister" means the Minister of Agriculture;

8. "owner" means a person having an animal in his possession or under his charge.

3. Any inspector may enter into or upon any premises and exercise any power and perform any duty with respect to the prevention or control of brucellosis or any other disease, conferred or imposed upon him by the regulations.

4. (1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations for the prevention and control of brucellosis and other diseases, and in particular, without limiting the foregoing generality, with respect to the following matters:

- (a) the powers and duties of inspectors with respect to the inspection and testing of animals;
- (b) the duties of owners;
- (c) the means to be employed for the purpose of identifying animals infected with brucellosis;
- (d) the inspection and branding of animals infected with brucellosis;
- (e) the disposition of animals reacting to a brucellosis test;
- (f) the order in which herds shall be inspected and tested for brucellosis in any part of the province;
- (g) the testing of herds on an individual basis for brucellosis;
- (h) calfhood vaccination for the prevention of brucellosis.

(2) Regulations made pursuant to subsection (1) shall be published in *The Saskatchewan Gazette* and shall take effect upon publication or upon such later date as may be stated therein.

9. Whenever it appears proper, the minister may direct an inspector or any other suitable person to examine into any alleged outbreak of brucellosis or any other disease; to cause such scientific investigations to be made with a view to determining the nature and source of the outbreak as under the circumstances are deemed necessary; and, in case an investigation shows reasonable ground for so doing, to take measures for its suppression or limitation in accordance with the regulations.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that these provincial statutes are superseded by the Dominion Animal Contagious Diseases Act, and that they are subject to the Contagious Diseases Act? Is that not the position?

Mr. STEWART: No, that statement is not correct. These statutes are within the provincial powers to pass, have been passed, and are the law of the province of Saskatchewan; and, as long as they do not conflict with the Dominion

Act they have not been ruled out, so they are still the law of the province, and the province acts under the authority of these statutes.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, provided they do not proceed under the dominion statute.

Mr. STEWART: They did not.

Mr. WRIGHT: And the dominion statute is the statute under which the responsibility is maintained for contagious diseases.

Mr. STEWART: Well, not necessarily, the dominion statute speaks for itself.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr. STEWART: And also, the provincial statutes speak for themselves; and if you read the sections to which I have referred you will find that the provincial governments have full power of inspection, checking and everything else.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes. Those sections are going to be placed on the record, but I would ask that the sections of the Dominion Contagious Act also be placed on the record along with them.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Dr. Taggart?

Mr. J. G. Taggart, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, recalled:

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes, I was asking Mr. Taggart, just before we adjourned, to produce the report from Dr. James respecting stomatitis, and particularly in the Burns' feed lot. He was requested in a telegram from the veterinary director general, Dr. Christie, to do that in a wire dated December 28. I would ask the deputy minister if he has that report?

The WITNESS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are copies of the report here.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Might I have one?—A. Yes.

Q. That report is dated the 28th of December, 1951—that is on page 2 of the report, Mr. Taggart—I haven't seen this before—and signed by N. V. James. That report was received on what date, Mr. Taggart? When was that received by the department in Ottawa?—A. I cannot tell you that, specifically but I would take it that if this report is dated the 28th it would go from Dr. James to Dr. Christie and from Dr. Christie to Ottawa.

Q. And it has not been received on January 4, according to the wire sent by Dr. Childs to Dr. Christie. You have no idea when that was received?—A. No, I have not.

Q. When was it brought to your attention in your position as more or less coordinator of the various branches and sections of the department?—A. The first I saw of this report?—I am not sure that this particular report did come to my attention as a document.

Q. I see. So far as this report is concerned—it is dated the 28th of December—you would say that as a report it never came to your attention?—A. No. It would have been when the situation finally was disclosed to me. There would be information about it. This report would undoubtedly be the background, or part of the background.

Q. When was it finally disclosed to you—the situation that prevailed there in Regina—sometime during the first week of February?—A. Yes. Pardon me, may I say just one thing?

Q. Yes.—A. I mentioned this morning that these reports did not come to me; that is, the reports from the veterinary offices in the field, to the district veterinary and to the veterinary director general. They do not, as reports.

But I do get each week a summary report from the director of each of the services. Mr. Young gives me a summary report which contains items from the Health of Animals division; items from their livestock and poultry division and items from the Plant Products division, and so on; but these are merely summary statements so I will get some conception of what may be happening.

Q. And did you at any time prior to the first week of February receive any summary from Mr. Young regarding the situation in Regina at the Burns' plant, and so on?—A. Not that I remember now, but I am having these reports checked and if something turns up I will produce it.

Q. Yes. Now, I come to this report from the inspector. I will just read the material portions:

Owner's Name Burns & Co. Ltd. P. O. Regina, Sask.

Nature of Disease Suspected Infectious Vesicular Stomatitis in Cattle
Action Taken Instructed by Dr. N. D. Christie, District Veterinarian, Regina, Sask. I visited above premises & inspected 207 cattle in feed lots & pens & found 30 of these cattle were exhibiting symptoms of Stomatitis, slobbering considerable amounts of saliva from the mouths, difficulty in drinking & inability to feed properly, temperatures slightly elevated & stiffness in gait when walking. I placed premises under quarantine but made arrangements for the ante-mortem inspection of cattle about to be slaughtered & the thorough cleansing & disinfection of yards, pens, and equipment. I also instructed the plant management to allow no visitors or other persons to enter the quarantined premises & also instructed them that no cattle would be tested or permits issued to allow cattle to be removed until further notice. Treatment was prescribed for the sick cattle the same as was prescribed for the diseased herds of L. T. Wass, Mr. L. Wood, & Mr. J. C. Smith which herds are now completely recovered & released from quarantine, daily visits will be made to the premises of Burns & Co. & inspections will be made and treatment supervised.

Then it goes on and gives the particulars of the nature of the declaration of the inspector under the Animal Contagious Act and, finally: "is hereby permitted to remove from out of the infected place known as feed lots and pens at the company's stockyards, Regina, Saskatchewan wagons for hauling feed and manure in the yards—'also all cattle which are free from symptoms of disease, for immediate slaughter at the time of ante-mortem inspection.' "

Now then, did you at any time receive, in this interim report that you mentioned now, that we had forgotten about this morning, was there any mention of this situation?—A. None that I remember; but, as I said, I am having this report searched and if there is a report I will submit it to the committee.

Q. I see. Now then, you said something this morning that in the reports that were made, you gave some reason why the words foot and mouth were not used, and you said to avert fear and danger—you didn't finish the sentence. What did you mean by that?—A. I meant this: after I was informed of stomatitis being present and of the doubt that it might be foot and mouth, it appeared to me and I think to all the officers of the department as being highly undesirable to use the words foot and mouth because if it were used it would be taken as a settled fact that it was foot and mouth that had infected that herd, if we use that word; and we thought that if we studied that and we turned out to be wrong—which could have been, either way—we would have created a great deal of alarm and fear, and upset unnecessarily; and, therefore, until we were sure what it was it was agreed that we should not unnecessarily spread alarm or doubt about what the situation was.

Q. Now, when was it that you and the other officers decided that the words foot and mouth should not be used for fear it might create unnecessary alarm?—A. We used the word among ourselves.

Q. Oh yes.—A. But not for public purposes, not until later.

Q. Or, not at the moment.—A. Well, since we were alarmed to the extent of thinking that it might be that disease.

Q. Now, when was that?—A. That would be about the middle of February. It would be between the time I first remember having knowledge of the thing, and that would be the first part of February, around the 8th or 10th.

Q. So the time when it was decided not to use the expression "foot and mouth disease" was between the 2nd February and the 8th February?—A. Yes, in that period of time.

Q. Now, then, in the production of documents ordered yesterday, for a copy of all communications that passed between the veterinary officials, either provincial or federal, and the federal Department of Agriculture—you saw this order of the House, did you not?—A. Yes.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, you tell us there are some weekly reports made between officials, were made, in regard to this matter, in part.—A. Yes, the regular weekly form reports continued to come in throughout that time.

Q. Now you say that you get a weekly report?—A. Yes, a form report, that is to say there is a form which is filled out weekly.

Q. And a matter such as the development of a disease, even though it was just stomatitis, would be included in such a weekly report?—A. Yes, I should think it was. As I told you, I do not see these reports every week.

Q. Have you got those weekly reports?—A. The weekly reports are all on file in the Health of Animals division.

Q. Are those not reports or communications that passed between veterinary officials of the federal Department of Agriculture? Are those not reports, communications made by veterinary officials? Were the veterinary officials in Regina?—A. Yes, these reports would come from Dr. Christie to Dr. Childs.

Q. To Dr. Childs, representing the Department of Agriculture in his capacity as veterinary director general, is that correct?—A. Yes.

Q. And as such, the type of information that would be passed on to you should it prove necessary for you to know the facts contained therein, is that not correct?—A. Yes, any reports made to me in the weekly summary report would be drawn from these weekly reports that come from all the district veterinarians to Dr. Childs.

Q. But certainly the reports that would come from a district like Regina where there had been an outbreak as serious as this, even though stomatitis, should occupy a prominent place in any weekly report that was made?—A. As I told you, I do not see those reports. They come to Dr. Childs. A summary comes to me of all the weekly routine reports from all veterinarians, and they would deal with any happenings in a district worthy of report.

Q. Would you not expect that a matter as serious as the outbreak of stomatitis would be considered of sufficient importance to be passed on to you in the summary of the various reports received by a person occupying the position of veterinary director general?—A. Vesicular stomatitis is not a reportable disease in the sense in which it is used in the Act.

Q. So that you would not— —A. That would not necessarily come to me.

Q. And so you would not expect that an outbreak of stomatitis or the existence of an epidemic in whatever form it was, necessitating the application of quarantine to the Burns plant, you would not expect that to be reported to you in a summary of the weekly reports?—A. Not necessarily, no.

Q. Knowing how similar the symptoms are between stomatitis and foot and mouth disease, don't you think, even to a layman, that that would be a precautionary measure that would be taken and you would be made aware of a situation that might prove to be dangerous?—A. Yes, it would seem a desirable procedure and I have no doubt it will be followed in future.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. I have no doubt that will happen in the future.

Q. Now, then, when you first became aware of the situation through Dr. Childs, Mr. Young, rather, did you ask him how it was that no information had been passed on to you up to that time?—A. No, my inquiry at that time—I was not familiar with this particular disease at all—my inquiry was just, is this a serious disease, is this reportable, are there any actions that should be taken, and I was informed stomatitis should not be regarded seriously, that there had been other outbreaks of this disease in Saskatchewan, in particular.

Q. In 1938?—A. I think 1938, 1939 were the years. Dr. Childs could verify that date. And on the strength of that assurance, it appeared to me that everything was being done that needed to be done.

Q. I see. Now, then, that would be the first or second of February. How many days after that was it that you first began to consider that everything that should have been done had not been done?—A. I do not know that I ever reached that conclusion.

Q. So that, so far as you are concerned now, you are satisfied that what everybody, that what officials did should have been done under all the circumstances?—A. Well, looking back with knowledge of what has happened one would say no. Looking at the position as we saw it at the time, it would appear that proper precautions had been taken.

Q. And looking forward and realizing how similar those two diseases are, and the terrible danger of this being foot and mouth disease, would you not have expected the same precautions to be taken?—A. Well, as I explained in answer to other questions, the veterinarians were satisfied from their examinations that they had vesicular stomatitis, and I was bound to accept their verdict on that technical matter.

Q. Well, then, you did not find out the contrary until the 19th, did you?—A. Well, by the 19th the doubts of the veterinary people had become quite important in their minds, or the 18th.

Q. When was the test first made that revealed as a result of analysis or clinical examination that this was stomatitis?—A. That it was stomatitis?

Q. Yes—no, that it was foot and mouth.—A. I cannot give you that date exactly, I do not know.

Q. The 24th?—A. Oh, the laboratory tests?

Q. Yes.—A. The laboratory tests were finalized on the 23rd or 24th, I think on Sunday, the 24th, and they confirmed the diagnosis that had then been made in Regina by Dr. Childs and his staff.

Q. Now, then, on what date did Dr. Childs make the diagnosis in Regina and confirm it as foot and mouth disease?—A. Shortly preceding that report from Hull. I cannot give you the exact date of that.

Q. He sent the wire on the 15th February, that is the telegram we mentioned this morning. On the 18th he sent a telegram to Mr. Young in Ottawa, which reads:

Clinical evidence amply justifies quarantine livestock municipalities indicated below for suspected infectious and contagious disease.

Was that the expression he used to cover foot and mouth disease, "suspected infectious and contagious disease"?—A. Well, it could be, because the day previously the Burns plant had been quarantined for stomatitis.

Q. I continue reading:

Ministerial order should be issued immediately establishing quarantine prohibiting movement of livestock out of and into quarantined municipalities except through shipments proceeding by rail which must not be unloaded within quarantine municipalities.

And then it goes on to indicate the areas.

I am trying to find out at what point was it, what day were you notified by Dr. Childs, or any of his staff, and before the clinical examination was made, that this is indeed in our opinion foot and mouth disease?—A. Well, that telegram you first read would be the nearest to a conclusion on that point that we had received at that time, but I do not believe they actually confirmed, even on clinical and field examinations, until some later date than that.

Q. Was it after the American doctor arrived that a decision was made it was foot and mouth disease?—A. I think the final decision, yes, indeed, because Dr. Shahan was in Regina prior to the final confirmation by Dr. Mitchell.

Q. That final confirmation you mention was before the clinical examination?—A. No, I think the clinical tests were made in Regina, the field tests at Regina, and the lab test in Hull, and the final test of the whole was the 23rd or 24th.

Q. And was the decision that it was foot and mouth disease arrived at before February 23?—A. I think officially the decision was made on the 24th.

Q. On the 24th?—A. Yes, although it appears from the record that Dr. Childs himself was convinced before that date that foot and mouth disease was present.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. It would appear from the record that Dr. Childs believed that foot and mouth disease was present before it was officially confirmed by the lab.

Q. When did he tell you?—A. I do not think he told me that himself.

Q. Did any official of the department before the 24th February notify you that in their opinion it was foot and mouth disease?—A. Mr. Young reported to me that Dr. Childs strongly suspected it was foot and mouth disease.

Q. And the date?—A. I cannot give you the exact date—before the 24th.

Q. Would it be on the 23rd?—A. It would be even earlier. The 23rd was Saturday, it would be a day or two perhaps before that. It might have been the 19th or the 20th, about that time.

Q. Now, do you have to give consent for permission to ship cattle out of an area or yard that has been quarantined? I will mention this case of March 4 that I have before me. I will read an item in the *Toronto Telegram* dealing with shipments from Regina. It reads:

Animals infected by foot and mouth disease may have been among shipments to Montreal and other eastern Canadian points, as well as to the United States, it was feared today.

Do you agree with that?—A. What is the date of that?

Q. The date is March 4.—A. That report says it was feared animals had been shipped.

Q. Yes. Do you share that fear or don't you?—A. Well, we know that animals were shipped prior to the application of the quarantine, the second quarantine on the Burns plant. I think I am right in that.

Q. It says:

From Regina, Jack McCusker, a cattle shipper, told the *Telegram* he had sent a shipment to Montreal on February 11 of animals he had acquired from a meat packing plant in Regina, well after infection had first been discovered in the plant.

A. Well, we can have the record on that.

Q. You have those records?—A. We would have the records if there was any outward movement of an interprovincial shipment.

Q. I would like you to produce that.—A. I think those records have been produced. That would be the records of shipments of cattle from Burns' establishment?

Q. Yes, on February 11. How many plants are there in Regina?—A. Inspected plants?

Q. Yes.—A. Two.

Q. What is the other?—A. Intercontinental. I think that is all there are.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Charlton?

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. First of all I want to ask Dr. Taggart this question: he said that their first official notice was around, I take it, the 23rd or 24th?—A. Excuse me, sir. The diagnosis which I understood Dr. Childs to have reached in his own mind some days earlier was confirmed at the Hull laboratories on the 23rd or 24th, but the confirmation by the laboratory test was subsequent. Perhaps I should not try to say what is in Dr. Childs' mind, but I think Dr. Childs had concluded pretty definitely that he had foot and mouth disease and that would be some days before the thing was confirmed by the laboratory at Hull, which confirmation became available on the 23rd or 24th.

Q. You sent word to the United States government on the 18th, did you not?—A. Yes; we told them that we had this disease and described the situation because we felt we must do so in our own interest, to keep faith, and to report anything that was even doubtful.

Q. You thought it was sufficiently serious to report to the United States that it was foot and mouth disease?—A. No, we did not do that; we reported the appearance of a disease, the symptoms of which resembled foot and mouth disease.

Q. Have you any reason to know that Dr. Childs changed his mind around the 8th or the 9th? You say he told you around the 1st or 2nd of February; he made some remark that it might be foot and mouth. What reason did he have in your opinion? Did he say anything to you to lead you to believe that he had changed his mind, or why he had changed his mind from the 17th of January to the 1st or 2nd of February?—A. No, I did not get any detailed reason for that.

Q. He did not make any statement?—A. I pointed out that Mr. Young reported to me verbally in the early days of February, or possibly earlier than that—that is the best I can do to place it—that we had this stomatitis at Regina; and I think undoubtedly he mentioned that the symptoms were superficially similar to those of foot and mouth. But it would be some days later that I had contact with Dr. Childs or Dr. Hall. Then shortly after that, I believe, Dr. Childs went to Regina. However, the exact dates of his movements can be given by Dr. Childs himself. I had very little contact with Dr. Childs during that period from the early part of February until we were finally sure we had foot and mouth.

Q. It appears on the record that on the 9th of February Dr. Childs went on statutory holidays?—A. That is the time during which I had very little contact; Dr. Hall was acting at that time; and if there were any three-party conversations, such as between Mr. Young, Dr. Hall and myself, they would be the three people rather than Dr. Childs, Mr. Young and myself.

Q. From the 9th day of February?—A. During the time Dr. Childs was away.

Q. When did Dr. Childs come back, as far as you know?—A. I have not the information on the exact duration of his leave; I think it was only for a week, and then I believe he came back short of his week.

Q. But he sent a wire to Dr. Christie on the 15th, did he not?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he do that from his home, or in his official capacity from the office?—A. I do not know that; Dr. Childs could answer that one.

Q. As I understand it in this report of December 28, which is signed by M. B. James, there is one particular statement I am quite interested in. It says that the temperature was slightly elevated and that there was stiffness in gait in walking; so that on the 28th apparently it was serious enough for them to think that the quarantine was necessary at the Burns plant at that time. Yet in a report dated March 24 and signed by T. Childs and reporting on this very thing, the department apparently thought,—in a summary of actions and procedures in connection with the outbreak of foot and mouth in the provinces of Saskatchewan—in the second paragraph Dr. Childs said there was no noticeable foot lesions in the feed lot at Regina. It is quite plain in this report that Dr. James thought there was a stiffness in gait when walking. So I would take it from that that there were some noticeable foot lesions, something noticeably wrong with the feet, yet in Dr. Childs' report he says there were no noticeable feet lesions. Still, on the 28th of December the plant was quarantined. Is it not true that on the 17th of January Dr. Childs himself went out there and released that quarantine?—A. Dr. Childs, I think, was in Regina on the 17th of January and I understand from reports which came to me that he examined the cattle in the Burns yard, and presumably the quarantine was lifted, although I cannot verify from my knowledge that his approval was subsequent to his being there.

Q. You would naturally think, though, that if Dr. Childs were there, it would not be on the authority of a lesser official of the department that the quarantine should be lifted?—A. It was put on in a routine way and reported; and presumably it could be taken off in the same way when the veterinarians in charge reported that they were free; but it would not necessarily follow that Dr. Childs himself removed the quarantine.

Q. So you do not know who it was who removed the quarantine?—A. No.

Q. You do not know who was responsible for taking it off?—A. No. The responsibility I suppose ultimately rests with Dr. Childs, but whether it was taken off by him or by one of his officers I do not know.

Q. When you say that the responsibility ultimately rests with Dr. Childs, I would say that it rests higher than that. But you say that Dr. Childs was responsible for the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, and he definitely must accept that responsibility.—A. I was using the word "responsibility" in a limited sense. Dr. Childs administers the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

Q. You think it would be perfectly all right then for a lesser official at Regina, for instance, having regard to the seriousness of the situation, to take that quarantine off on the 17th of January? You think that would be perfectly all right as far as your department is concerned?—A. I assume the quarantine was applied in the first place by the officials on the ground, the inspectors in consultation with Dr. Christie; and Dr. Christie, in turn, would report that to Ottawa. I doubt—although I am not sure of my ground—whether Dr. Christie would ask for and get authority to apply that quarantine before he did so. That is a point of procedure and I am not sure of it. Dr. Childs could answer that question, of course.

Q. You are not sure then whether he would have had to get the consent of Dr. Childs before he would put on the quarantine?—A. No. I would prefer it if you would ask Dr. Childs that question.

Q. But you are satisfied in your own mind that this procedure that he followed, having regard to the seriousness of the situation, and knowing very well that it could be easily mistaken for foot and mouth disease, that it would be perfectly all right for one of the officials at Regina to release that quarantine at the Burns plant?—A. Knowing perfectly well, as you suggested, that this disease resembles foot and mouth, I know that now, but I did not know anything particularly about stomatitis when it was first reported.

Q. So you would change some things now?—A. As far as I am concerned, I would be more concerned if I heard a suggestion of anything of this sort because the words “vesicular stomatitis” conveyed no particular meaning to me at that time.

Q. Yet you had no indication whatsoever previous to the 1st or 2nd of February that it might be anything other than vesicular stomatitis?—A. Any recollections of any indication prior to that date would stick in my memory; Mr. Young might have mentioned the matter to me earlier, but if he did so, it did not make sufficient impression to be remembered, and there is no record which I can find in my files, or that I have been able to find so far.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Wright.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What was the earliest date to your knowledge or through reports which have been given to you of any veterinarian, either a private or a government veterinarian suggesting that the outbreak which was being called vesicular stomatitis might possibly be something else?—A. That is a very difficult question to answer. I do not remember.

Q. To your knowledge or through reports that you had, you say that is as far as you can go?—A. Yes.

Mr. BROWNE: Did he not answer that question this morning? I think he answered that question to me this morning.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. No. This is a different question to yours. I say “any veterinarian, either a government veterinarian or a private veterinarian who was in the area suggesting” to the department either in Regina or to yourself, to your knowledge, as to when the first suggestion was made?—A. One would have to examine the records very carefully, looking backward to find when that suggestion first was made and by whom. And I must confess that I cannot recall any document now that would attribute to any person the suggestion that this was foot and mouth. I have no doubt that it might have been rumoured about among the veterinarians. They must have mentioned it, but I have no documents or memory of it being mentioned to me and I do not remember hearing anything about it prior to Mr. Young’s telling me about it.

Q. Have you information as to how many community pastures there are within the quarantine zone and within the buffer zone?—A. I think there would be no community pastures within the quarantine zone. There are, speaking from memory and subject to correction, four which are wholly or partly within the buffer zone, but I will have to get the records to be sure of my ground there.

Q. When was the decision made to open these pastures to stock from the buffer zone, and by whom was the decision made, and was it referred to your department in Ottawa here? It seems to me that the opening of these pastures within the buffer zone must have been a matter which was considered by your department.—A. The re-opening of these pastures or the stocking of them in the spring would not be a matter which would be referred here to Ottawa; and in the case of pastures in or near the buffer zone, the re-opening there would be determined between the P.F.R.A. officials in Regina and the veterinarians in Regina.

Q. Your department, under the Contagious Diseases Act, did not make any suggestion to the people in charge of P.F.R.A. that it might be advisable to restrict the opening of these pastures until such time as it might be determined whether the disease was actively contained?—A. The matter was discussed undoubtedly between Dr. Christie, Dr. Wells, Mr. Thomson, and the pasture manager, Mr. Youngman; but I have no personal knowledge of

what this conversation was. I would believe that the re-opening was decided upon after consultation between the two groups of officers, all of them employees of our department.

Mr. QUELCH: I have a question. Were all the cattle returned to the community pastures in the buffer zone carefully inspected?

The WITNESS: They have a routine inspection of the cattle when they are admitted to the pasture but just how detailed that inspection is I am not sure. They are identified by brand—if necessary they are branded and recorded—but they do get an inspection. You would have to get the men who were doing it to find out what the inspection was.

Mr. WRIGHT: There were no instructions went out from your department in Ottawa with respect to taking any special care with regard to opening of pastures in the buffer zone?

The WITNESS: There were no special instructions issued from my office with respect to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other member wish to ask a question?

By Mr. Browne:

Q. The deputy minister promised to bring a report—the first report that he had of foot and mouth disease. Has he brought this afternoon that first written report?—A. The first written report to me?

Q. Yes?—A. I am sorry, I missed that. I am afraid I did not note that.

Q. The next question I would like to ask him then, if he has not got that now—

Some MEMBERS: He has it now.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Oh.—A. I have another report; I do not think it is the one I am being asked for. The report I have, Mr. Chairman, is Dr. Mitchell's memorandum to Dr. Young confirming his findings or reporting his findings from the lab—which confirmed the diagnosis of the disease.

Q. Of what date?—A. This is dated the 29th of February—but the first report given to Dr. Childs by Dr. Mitchell would be given verbally. This merely confirms the verbal report.

Q. When did you first get definite, written information that this was foot and mouth disease?—A. The first information I had was given to me by Dr. Young in the early days of February.

Q. I say "in writing"? Have you anything of that nature at all?—A. Not of that nature because we were in constant personal contact daily and there were no written reports to me at that stage.

Q. I take it this report of Inspector James is a routine report which he must carry out according to the regulations covering infectious diseases?—A. I would think so.

Q. "The treatment prescribed for the sick cattle was the same as that prescribed for the diseased herds of L. T. Waas, R. L. Wood, and J. C. Smith, which herds are now completely recovered."

Were there reports of the inspection in regard to these three herds?—A. I have not that personally—they are in the H. of A. reports.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. I just want to ask the deputy minister the exact location of all the cattle that were present in the Burns plant or yards at the time that the quarantine was lifted on the 17th of January? I think that information should

be available to us and the actual disposition of all cattle that were there at the time on January 17th when that quarantine was lifted; and what happened between January 17th and February 17th when the quarantine was put back on at the Burns yard in Regina? Now there is the point from which all the infection that has spread in this particular disease has probably emanated—from the time the quarantine was lifted on the 17th of January to the time it was re-imposed on the 17th of February. I see the minister looking in *Hansard* and I know that some of it is already there.—A. I am under the impression that some of it is in *Hansard*.

Q. But it is not nearly all there?—A. I was under the impression that it was. If there is any deficiency in that information it certainly can be supplied because there is a record of where those animals went.

Q. Not only the animals but the carcasses killed in the Burns plant during that time. The second last outbreak has been caused by an infected carcass—whether it came from the Burns plant or where it has come from, it caused the second last outbreak. I think all the carcasses should be traced as well.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I think the deputy minister replied to a question by Mr. Diefenbaker sometime ago that some of the cattle that were in the Burns plant at that time had been shipped out of the province to Montreal. Is that right? Some of them were shipped out of Saskatchewan—out of the 207 head?—A. In this period between January 17th and February 17th?

Q. In any period after—A. After the lifting of the first quarantine?

Q. No, after December 28th?—A. No, I cannot give you that offhand. That is in *Hansard* I think—the destinations of those cattle.

Q. You are not certain whether any cattle were sent out?

MR. WRIGHT: Were they live cattle? I thought all the live cattle were slaughtered.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. "This informant was Mr. Jack McCusker who told the Toronto Telegram he sent a shipment to Montreal on February 11th of animals he acquired from the meat plant in Regina well after the infected disease was discovered in the plant." Is that statement correct?—A. I cannot tell you offhand; but we can produce the destinations of all the cattle.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: Find the ones Mr. McCusker shipped? He apparently gave the interview and said he got the cattle from this plant where the infection was and he shipped them east.

The WITNESS: I cannot give you that information but if it is not complete in *Hansard* I can give you the rest.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. The question in *Hansard* was—and this is my own question:

"How many live cattle were sold by Burns and Company, Regina, or any agent thereof, from (a) December 1, 1951, to December 27, 1951; (b) December 28, 1951 to January 6, 1952; (c) since January 17, 1952? How many of each of the above groups of cattle were confined to points in (a) Saskatchewan; (b) other parts of Canada; (c) the United States?"

Q. I have not got the date of the return but I do not think that would have a bearing on it—oh, oh, March 19th, 1952, page 587 of *Hansard*.—A. The information should be complete up to the date of your question.

Q. There could not have been any go out since then—because the quarantine is still on? So, I do not know where this man got the cattle which he shipped

out?—That is the information but I am not in a position to say whether Mr. McCusker was in error in making that statement, but that is the information we have as to the departures from the Burns establishment.

Q. Within the knowledge of the department there were no cattle shipped out of that plant—well, at any time from December 1st on to other parts of Canada?—A. That is right.

Q. Within that period 52 head were shipped to other parts of Saskatchewan. I wonder if any of those 52 were shipped into the Weyburn area or the Ormiston area where the new outbreak has taken place?—A. I cannot answer that from memory, but when that record was produced I think it was observed by somebody that all of these shipments went to an area within about 50 miles from Regina—all the shipments in Saskatchewan—which, if correct, would exclude Weyburn.

Q. In regard to community pastures, are all community pastures within the buffer or quarantine area open?—A. I rather think there is one operating at Truax—constructed recently—but are the P.F.R.A. pastures in the quarantine area all operating or open?—A. There are no pastures in the quarantine area and the pastures in the buffer zone would be open I think without exception—I beg your pardon, Ormiston is not.

Q. Are any special precautions being taken now in regard to the community pastures that are open?—A. As I said there was conversation between the veterinarian officials and the pasture management at the time, and continuing consultations. They are both in Regina.

Q. There is no increased inspection or increased precautions relative to the pastures that are operating?—A. Well there is inspection of the cattle inward to the pasture.

Q. Well, I do not know if they have had any increased inspection of cattle going into the community pastures, but I know the inspection that takes place ordinarily is just no inspection at all. It is a matter of getting the cattle branded, identified, and records made of the cattle going into the pasture.

Hon. Mr. GARDINER: If the committee will permit me to answer that question I may say I was in Regina within the last two weeks and I gave the instructions myself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Hon. Mr. GARDINER: If the committee will permit me—I am not on the stand myself being questioned but the deputy does not know this himself and I do not suppose he can answer—but I was in Regina within the last two weeks.

Mr. WRIGHT: On what date?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I would have to go back and look up the dates, but I discussed the matter with Dr. Christie and Dr. Thompson and I gave the definite instructions that there was to be special checking.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Was that done verbally or was it put on record?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Verbally.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Some of those things should go on record.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: We have pretty good officials.

Mr. WRIGHT: With pretty poor memories sometimes.

Mr. ARGUE: If the minister was in Regina and gave his own personal instructions to the departmental officials out there, then I take it the minister must have also given the instructions or else O.K.'d the instructions that these community pastures should be opened.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is done every year around the first of May. The general instructions are that they do not open until the first of May but in a year like this the tendency was to open them a little earlier.

Mr. ARGUE: The general instructions are that community pastures be opened about the 1st of May, but this was a different situation entirely. There had never been foot and mouth disease before. It is all right to say that hindsight is better than foresight but it seemed to me a mistake all of the time to open the pastures. I think I can quite honestly say that was my opinion and I mentioned it in the House when this debate was taking place. I mentioned community pastures and I suggested that other steps be taken to look after those cattle. The community pasture at Ormiston is not open but had it been open and had there been the Weyburn situation again you would have had 2,500 head of cattle to slaughter. I think that was taking an undue risk.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I wonder if the deputy minister can tell us just how serious the disease vesicular stomatitis is—when it is vesicular stomatitis? Is it not under the Act at the present time. It is a fairly mild disease and something about which no one needs to worry too much, is that right?—A. I cannot give evidence on that disease, but Dr. Childs or one of the veterinarian officers could.

Q. The deputy minister has no idea, as a result of the discussions that he has had and the experience in regard to foot and mouth disease, and everything that has happened? He has no opinion as to the seriousness of the disease, vesicular stomatitis? None at all?—A. Any opinions I would form would have to be based on the information from the veterinarian officers and they, of course, tell me that vesicular stomatitis is not regarded as a serious disease. It is not listed as a compulsorily reportable disease.

Q. From the information you have had and I take it you are not saying that you be responsible for that information, but the information you have is that it is not a disease serious enough, for example, to enforce quarantine regulations?—A. Well, they quarantine for it. Yes. There are a good many diseases which may not be very serious but for which they will quarantine just to prevent disease from spreading and doing damage to other people.

Q. But it is not a reportable disease?—A. Not compulsorily.

The CHAIRMAN: Might I suggest that Dr. Childs answer that question, it being a technical one.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. I wonder if Mr. Taggart could tell us who was looking after these cattle shipments going out from the Burns' feed lot. According to this return—it us up to the end of the year, December 28th—it is—1951? There was considerable discussion about this in the House when the matter was up not so long ago; and, as I recall it, on that particular date there were 52 of these cattle shipped to some other places in Saskatchewan—153 head of cattle. Do I take it then, or do you know whether these 153 head of cattle were disposed of in the normal fashion?—A. Well, as I said before, Mr. Chairman, I thought these cattle had all been accounted for in the return to the House, and I thought that information was on *Hansard*. I might read to you from *Hansard*, at page 588—the *Hansard* of March 19—in reply to Mr. Argue's question as to how many live cattle were sold by the Burns' Company, and it referred to groups of cattle. It is practically certain, I should say that these cattle could not be shipped from the Burns' establishment in single shipments, but there might be two or three or half a dozen go on one truck to one farm. Now, the answer dealing with that 52, in all probability that covers more than 52 animals, I rather believe that refers to the number of shipments, 52 shipments.

Q. Oh yes, there were 52 shipments.—A. I would take it from the way the question was answered that it is 52 shipments to 52 points in Saskatchewan. Now, I would have to go back and look into the record to see whether that is exactly right or not.

Q. For our next meeting might I ask that you bring in a return of the information showing the disposal of these 207 head of cattle, 145 head of sheep and 50 head of swine? And, can you give us where they were shipped to; and, if they were not shipped out, whether they were slaughtered? I take it from the information you gave in your evidence this morning from what I think you called your inspection reports that they would indicate where that meat was shipped, if the animals were slaughtered; particularly, in so far as the cattle, sheep and swine that were slaughtered were concerned. And I would like as a second return a copy of these letters, or lists of these inspection slips or inspection returns—whatever the proper name is—showing where that meat went to, where the carcasses went; and I think, if we get that information we would then have definitely the disposition of these animals which were in the Burns' Company stockyard on December 28. Now, there is a further question: following the lifting of the quarantine on January 17 on the Burns' Company yards I would like to know what cattle, sheep and swine then went into the yard and what disposition was made of those animals. And now, we could get that from the Burns people, they could give us that information.—A. I am under the impression that was given to the House in the form of a return. We will certainly check up on it.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. If I might now, I would like to refer to a letter which appears in this return. It is a letter written by Mr. Saint for the veterinary director general, and it says: "Attached hereto for your information is a list of shipments of meats and other animal products consigned by est. 23E, Burns and Company, Saskatchewan, to various points throughout Canada. Please note this list includes shipments made on and after November 16, up to January 23 and includes the description of the product and the consignee. After the latter date no shipments were made." It does not give anything beyond that date. It gives the shipments up to the 23rd, but it does not go from the 23rd to the 28th; and it does not give the numbers, it shows the car numbers, the grades, the number of pounds, and so on in detail. It gives the detail of the shipments of meat and carcasses, it gives the disposal of the animals.—A. Mr. Chairman, that return I think is intended to be complete to the 19th only. I haven't Mr. Saint's letter, but I am told that these declarations are complete up to the 19th of February.

Q. That is what it says, up to the 19th; but it does not give the right answer. I am going to ask this question regarding Mr. Jack McCusker. He is reported to have given a statement to the *Toronto Telegram* that he sent a shipment to Montreal on February 11 of animals he acquired from a meat packing plant in Regina where infection had been discovered. He also indicates that there were two plants in Regina and there was only one in which infection had been detected. He says that he gave this statement to be correct. I can only take it that Mr. Jack McCusker's memory is sound as to the statement he made to the *Toronto Telegram*, that he shipped a shipment of cattle on February 11 of animals—these must be live animals—and they came from the Burns Company; and they are not included in the statement, so this report is just specious.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the return that Mr. Diefenbaker just referred to is not in answer to your question?

Mr. HARKNESS: From what I can make out of the report, I do not think it is. What I wanted to know is, first, the disposition of these animals, both in the form of live animals and in the form of carcasses. The next point we want to know about is, what animals were in this yard at the time of the lifting of the quarantine on January 17, before the next quarantine was imposed; and, what disposition was made of those animals. That, I take it, will give us the picture of what we want.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I loaned my copy of these documents to somebody this morning, and there are not many other copies; but I assume that information is on there about the point he raised; if it is not, it ought to be.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Decore?

By Mr. Decore:

Q. Mr. Chairman, before I ask the deputy minister any question, I would just like to draw his attention to section 9 of the Contagious Diseases Act (Sask.) if I may: being chapter 70 of the revised statutes of Saskatchewan, 1949, of section 9, and this particular section reads:

"Whenever it appears proper, the minister may direct an inspector or any other suitable person to examine into any alleged outbreak of brucellosis or any other disease; to cause such scientific investigations to be made with a view to determining the nature and source of the outbreak as under the circumstances are deemed necessary; and, in case an investigation shows reasonable ground for so doing, to take measures for its suppression or limitation in accordance with the regulations".

Now, the second question I want to put to Dr. Taggart is: have there been any representations made by the provincial minister or his deputy, either directly to you or to anybody else in your department, to your knowledge, expressing concern about this cattle disease, say prior to the middle of February last?—A. I have no memory of any communications directly from the provincial government prior to February concerning this problem.

Q. Do you know whether or not there were any provincial officials who joined in with you? Did you have any appeals in Regina in connection with this natural disaster?—A. None that is on our report; and I think this information has been given to the House in answer to questions—a number of veterinarians examined one or more of these herds and reported on them and diagnosed them as having vesicular stomatitis.

Q. Was that for the government or by private veterinarians?—A. Private veterinarians, reporting, I think, to both the provincial and federal veterinarians; and I am not sure whether the provincial veterinarians examined, or how many of them examined herds on the ground. To the best of my knowledge there are no provincial veterinaries employed full time by the province of Saskatchewan. Now, on this, here again I am not giving evidence on a point I have no personal knowledge of.

Q. Did you get any assistance from the provincial veterinaries?—A. There is nothing in our report to indicate that as far as I can recall.

Q. Did you get any assistance from the provincial Department of Agriculture for some time prior to the middle of February; any capital assistance or otherwise?—A. I do not think there was any connection between the provincial staff and our staff prior to that date. I do not know of any. There was subsequently, after the disease was confirmed the provincial government did assist our veterinaries in a number of ways.

Q. Well, is it usually the case that the provincial Department of Agriculture would cooperate to the fullest extent with the federal Department of Agriculture in the case of any serious outbreak of this nature?—A. Oh, I think that is usual, yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Would you not say that was general in the Department of Agriculture in Regina, that every effort was made to cooperate with the federal department?—A. I have no reason for saying anything else. After the disease was known and identified we got complete cooperation from the provincial Department of Agriculture.

Q. And before the disease was known you would not have had any occasion for that?—A. No, we would not have had any occasion for that.

By Mr. McLean:

Q. After it became apparent that this outbreak might be foot and mouth disease and a quarantine was imposed was there any attempt made to restrict the movement of cattle coming from other parts of Saskatchewan, beyond the areas in which the first outbreak occurred?—A. I could give you some information on that now.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Taggart has something he would like to put on the record and which might anticipate many questions members would like to ask.

The WITNESS: This is a memorandum from the Health of Animals division reporting the movement of live stock for November, December, January and February from the Burns' Company and the inter-continental packers yards in Regina.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Who signed that?—A. It is not signed, it is a routine report to Ottawa respecting the movement of cattle.

Q. To whom?—A. To the director of production services. It is a more complete return than the other one to which we referred I take it this return may be more complete than the return which was given to the House. I am sure about that because I think the return to the House carried it up to the 19th of February and this gives to the end of February; and, of course, there would be no difference because there will be no shipments after the 19th of February. The information contained on this indicates that the number of head of cattle moved directly from the plant was 207.

Mr. MACLEAN (*Queens*): That is the total number?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Is that split up as between the two plants?—A. Yes, I think so. From Burns, no, from Intercontinental, shipments amounted to 69 out of a total of 207. I can summarize that by saying that these cattle were shipped to 26 individual people, or 26 destinations perhaps, and that the destinations were in: R. M. 128, Bechard; R. M. 219, Earl Grey; R. M. 159, Regina, Sherwood; R. M. 156, Indian Head; R. M. 128, Lajord; R. M. 161, Moose Jaw; R. M. 221, Penzance; R. M. 159, Sherwood municipality; R. M. 158, Richardson.

Now, those municipalities are all within the quarantine zone or the buffer zone and not far outside of the quarantine zone. The information is that there were no cattle shipped to other destinations outside of that area during the months November, December, 1951, January and February, 1952 from Burns & Company and from the Intercontinental Company. Now, that seems to suggest that Mr. McCusker must have been in error when he claimed to have taken cattle out of one of these plants to Montreal because the two facts do not jibe. What the explanation is, I cannot say.

Q. Mr. Taggart, can you give us any information as to where the carcass or the animal came from that was responsible for the Ormiston outbreak. It was reported the Ormiston outbreak was the result of certain meat. Where did that carcass come from, when was it shipped out, what plant was it from, when was it received by the people at Ormiston, and all of the details, with respect to that particular carcass, that you have in your department?—A. I have very few details, but, from memory, the carcass was purchased from a local butcher by a farmer named Kivall.

Q. From a local butcher?—A. Yes.

Q. Where did he get it?—A. I have not the information as to the origin, if there was an origin back of that, whether he purchased it as a quarter of beef or purchased it as an animal and killed it.

Q. Are you coming before this committee, Mr. Taggart, and telling us that an outbreak has taken place out there two or three weeks ago and your department has no information on that certain animal and you have not traced that animal as yet?—A. I said I have not the information myself. The veterinarians would be, undoubtedly, making every effort to find the origin of that disease. The probability is, according to other experience, that we only sort out the probabilities, and the chances certainly of pinning it down to a particular source are not very good.

Q. And you have no further report on that from your department?—A. I have not, but, as I said, the investigation is carried on by the veterinarians on the ground and whatever findings they have found will be reported to Dr. Childs, but that will be produced by the men who handle the records.

Q. It seems to me in a case like this where a fresh outbreak has occurred—

Right hon. Mr. GARDINER: May I raise an objection to this procedure, Mr. Chairman? The men who have all that information are sitting here waiting to give it, so why are we having all this performance here trying to question a man who has not got the information and should not have it. As a matter of fact, when you are dealing with a disease of this kind you are not spreading rumour all over the country, such as this statement here made by a Montreal man who could not know where the cattle came from. The men are here ready to give you the right information, so let them give it.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. After all, we are entitled to know what co-ordination is in this department. Surely the deputy minister in charge of the department has some knowledge and has available to him the facilities to answer. As far as details are concerned I can understand what the minister says, but surely a deputy minister, representing the minister, should have available to him this information.

I want to draw one matter to his attention. He mentioned a moment ago that because of the fact that he has a document that does not show McCusker's name, it does not answer McCusker. As a matter of fact, McCusker lives in Sherwood municipality. In any event, the shipment was made to him there and delivered to Montreal, and all one has to do is to ask this man McCusker as to whether or not he, in fact, purchased these cattle from Burns during the period the place was under quarantine.

I want to ask the minister this. During that period of the quarantine quite a large number of shipments were made by Burns and Company. I see here in the document, pages 32 and 33 in return tabled yesterday, which apparently does not contain all the documents because that document there is one which should be included in it as well as the report from Dr. James. That was not included. I would ask him to tell us how it was that during the period January 5 to 17 such extensive shipments were made by Burns and Company from this plant to all parts of Canada. Was that permitted under the quarantine, or was the quarantine restricted only to the feedlots and the rest of the place operated during the time of the quarantine.—A. Dr. James had better answer that question, but my answer would be that the quarantine applied to the yards and to the animals and to the removal of live animals from the yards, but under inspection the meat itself would have moved.

Q. So meat was permitted to be removed?—A. To be removed out.

Q. And that would be the explanation of this document which indicates some bundles of hides, skins, and many thousands of pounds of beef were

shipped from Burns to Montreal, to Toronto, to Quebec city, to Newmarket, to Chicago, to Windsor, and then scraps sent to McCabe Meat Meal, of which it does not give the address; so the explanation is, as far as these products are concerned, hides and the like, they could be shipped out from Burns and Company during the period of quarantine. That is correct?—A. Those products would be shipped out under inspection.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. The deputy minister said they are shipped out under inspection, but are they going to tell us those animals were not infected when they were shipped out, when they were slaughtered? The report here, signed by Dr. James, which is form PHA 59, "Licence for removal of animals from infected place," says:

Under the authority of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, R.S.C., 1927.

Burns and Co., Ltd., Regina, Sask. is hereby permitted to remove from out of the infected place known as feed lots and pens at the company's stockyards, Regina, Sask. wagons for hauling feed and manure in the yards—"also all cattle which are free from symptoms of disease, for immediate slaughter at the time of anti-mortem inspection." All vehicles, equipment and boots and clothing of attendants to be thoroughly cleansed and disinfected each day and no person excepting regular staff of employees to enter or leave yards, and no cattle to be tested or removed from premises until further notice.

Now, what cattle were free from symptoms of disease? 207 cattle, the number of animals on the premises minus 30, that is 177. 177 cattle that could have been shipped out of there. Now, is he sure that at that time none of these cattle were coming down with disease later when they were slaughtered? That material, that beef was sent, as Mr. Diefenbaker said, right from British Columbia through to Quebec, and even as I understand it, the quarantine, the second quarantine was put on at the Burns plant on the 17th February. I thought it was the 17th February. It was given to us before. On February 29, Procter and Gamble of Hamilton, Ontario, received 59,700 pounds of inedible oil or fat, I imagine it is, and there were hides and meat sent all over the country.—A. Well, as I said, Mr. Chairman, those shipments went out of that plant under H. of A. inspection during the time quarantine was in suspense, and I think, from the records, prior to that.

Q. From January 17 to February 17?—A. Yes.

Q. There was nothing to stop anything from going out?—A. Nothing, except regular inspection for interprovincial shipments.

Q. The quarantine was lifted on January 17?—A. Yes.

Q. What possible reason could anybody have for stopping a live animal from being taken out of the Burns yard to ship to Montreal or British Columbia?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There would not need to be any objection because they are not in this business.

Mr. CHARLTON: If they are not in that business they would not be shipping out, but evidently there were some shipped out. There would be no reason—

The WITNESS: Cattle going out of stockyards to country points must go out under inspection. They are not allowed to go out without it.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. A kind of a quarantine sieve?—A. That applies to Toronto and everywhere else.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. I wonder if the deputy minister has a copy of the report, and if he can reconcile the order which is made on PHA 49 with the one referred to by my honourable friend, No. PHA 59. 49 says "I hereby certify that I have examined" all these cattle that were "on the premises of Burns & Co. at their stockyards in Regina, and said to belong to or to be in charge of the above owners and suspect the said cattle to be suffering from an infectious and contagious disease known as infectious vasicular stomatitis. The said cattle are hereby ordered to be held in quarantine until released by a veterinarian of the federal Department of Agriculture..."

Now, on the same date he says that all cattle which are free from the symptoms of disease may be removed from the plant. How do you reconcile the one and the other?—A. I should think that Dr. Childs or some of his men can answer that question.

Q. Can the deputy minister answer it?—A. I cannot, no.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Just a minor point of explanation. On page 34 of this return which was tabled yesterday—has the deputy minister a copy of it there?—A. No, I have not a copy.

Q. I believe it is the fourth shipment from the top of the page, on January 25, Burns, C.A.L. What does that abbreviation stand for? Would that happen to be Calgary or California, or what is it? What is that C.A.L.?—A. V.A.N. is probably Vancouver.

Q. You say V.A.N. is Vancouver, and so C.A.L. is Calgary?—A. Probably.

Q. It is pretty difficult to tell where shipments go when you abbreviate it that way. I take it to mean Calgary and Vancouver.—A. I would assume that; that is shipped to their plants in Calgary or Vancouver, as the case may be.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no more questions of Dr. Taggart, we have Dr. Childs with us, the Veterinary Director-General for the federal Department of Agriculture. I am going to ask Dr. Childs to look at my watch here before calling upon him, and I will get the feeling of the committee as to when this meeting should adjourn, so that Dr. Childs will have an idea when to break off. Is 6:00 o'clock agreeable to the committee?

Agreed.

We will call on Dr. Childs now to give his report of this disease from its inception, I presume, up to the present time.

Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director-General, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and hon. gentlemen: first I feel I should give you a brief outline of the duties and responsibilities of the Health of Animals division so that you may be a little clearer in your mind as to what procedures are followed in dealing with various things.

We are responsible—I mean the Health of Animals division—for keeping track of the disease situation in all countries of the world. We get reports from various countries with which we have trade relations about the disease situation. We at least get monthly reports and if there is anything serious which occurs we get them more often. We get cables on certain things. There is that about it.

We have, then, certain safeguards to prevent the introduction of those diseases into Canada. That is, livestock come in under a permit, which is issued under the authority of the minister. And if a country is not declared to be free of the serious animal diseases, that country does not get a permit. That is all.

In any case, if the animals do come in on a permit, they are placed under quarantine and they go to a quarantine station for a certain period of time.

From various countries we receive shipments of hides and such like, countries which have foot and mouth, and rinderpest; but they come into Canada in a certain way; if they are hard dried, there is no danger of disease. All right. But if not, here are restrictions, and they go to a tannery where they are disinfected; they come in under seal and the seal on the car is broken by an officer of the department, and the hides are processed and disinfected under supervision.

In addition to that, of course, there are some 115 or more packing plants in Canada which are under departmental supervision and inspection. A goodly number of these plants, some 70 or more, are plants where slaughtering is carried on. And to give you an idea of what goes on at those plants, I mean what the supervision is of animals which are sent in there for slaughter for food purposes, they receive an antemortem inspection; that is, a veterinarian looks them over, and if he sees anything amiss with an animal or animals, they are put aside in a separate pen, and they will be tagged in the ear with a departmental tag, and held back; and they will be re-examined; and if it is decided that they can be slaughtered without any danger, they will be slaughtered at the end of the regular kill.

In addition to that, of course, plant supervision means this: that all steps from the time the animal is driven into the plant and slaughtered until the finished product is packaged, are under supervision. We check the proper marking, and see that the designation on the food is correct as to the contents, and all that. That is just to give you some idea of what goes on there.

Well now, there are many other ramifications of this thing, such as the tuberculosis program and others of that kind. However, that does not come close to the subject under discussion here today.

To come back to this foot and mouth disease now, the first intimation we had of a vesicular disease at that time was the report of that difficulty by a certain gentleman in McLean, Saskatchewan. His herd was examined first by a private practitioner.

Mr. WRIGHT: What was the name of the man?

The WITNESS: That would be, I suppose, permissible? It would be all right to give the name? It has been shown often enough. It was T.L. Waas, I think.

It was there that the disease first appeared, according to the owner, about the 26th of November. He called in a local practitioner from somewhere down the line, Indian Head, I think; that practitioner was ill and from the symptoms given by the owner, that veterinary prescribed a digestive remedy.

Mr. WRIGHT: What was the name of that practitioner?

The WITNESS: His name was Richards, I believe; I am sorry that I cannot give you his initials; it was Dr. Richards.

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, I think we had better let Dr. Childs go right through with his statement and then have the question period follow that.

Mr. WRIGHT: From the very general sort of remarks he is making, we want particular information in this committee, and I think the witness should particularize more in his statement, or it will not be of much value to the committee.

Mr. JUTRAS: I think this information is very valuable to us in getting the general set-up first, and I think we should give the witness a chance to make a general statement.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I think he should make his statement, but I think he could be a little more precise and not be so mysterious as when he said that a certain gentleman in Saskatchewan had some cattle; I think he should give us the name. He is making it too mysterious.

The WITNESS: To come back to Mr. Waas, and by the way his initials should be L.T. His cattle apparently developed this condition, and it was first noticed on the 26th of November. The local practitioner on being advised of the condition over the telephone, and being ill, could not go out to see them, so he prescribed for them, and I think he prescribed a physic, thinking it was digestive trouble.

Then two neighbours came over, I believe, to assist Mr. Waas in administering the medicine. One of the neighbours was a man named Wood, and the other was named Smith. That was done and a few days later when the cattle did not seem to be improving in the way they should, apparently, Mr. Waas, I believe, called the Animal Health Department at Regina, and I think it would be the provincial department.

It is my understanding that they sent out Dr. Hunter who, I believe, is the assistant provincial veterinary. Dr. Johnson is the provincial veterinary.

They sent Dr. Hunter out and he had a look at them. I might say that it was 9:00 o'clock at night and it was hardly fair to have to make an examination under artificial light; but it was apparently done and he pronounced it to be a virus disease and decided that he should go back and read up on it, that is, look it up.

I believe that was on the 1st of December; and I think he reported this to our branch out there, our district office, the next day, which would be the 2nd day of December.

The result was that he went out along with Dr. Carlson, and Dr. James of the Health of Animals division, and they looked over these cattle and came to the conclusion that it was vesicular stomatitis. Now, that was that. Dr. James wired in that information and we wired back: "Please place them under quarantine."

Mr. WRIGHT: Are the dates of these wires in the report?

The WITNESS: The date of the wire would probably be the 3rd; I have not got the date here; I mean the 3rd of December.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is not in the record or in the return which was brought down yesterday.

The WITNESS: Anyway, they were instructed to quarantine the herd and keep them under close observation. That was done.

Mr. HARKNESS: Did you say that the area was quarantined?

The WITNESS: No. The herd was quarantined.

Mr. HARKNESS: You mean the Waas farm was quarantined?

The WITNESS: That is right, sir. They were kept under close observation. Dr. James visited that herd a number of times thereafter and said they were coming along very fine, so much so that he reported their recovery on the 8th of December.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is that in the documents too?

The WITNESS: I think so.

Mr. CHARLTON: Could you explain the inoculation which Dr. James made at that time?

The WITNESS: Yes. Dr. James inoculated two horses at Waas' by using the tongue scarification method and rubbing in material from the affected animals.

Mr. WRIGHT: On what date was that?

The WITNESS: That would be the 3rd, I believe.

Mr. WRIGHT: You mean the 3rd of December?

The WITNESS: Yes, that is right. And as I said, they were kept under observation and they appeared to have recovered. And if my memory is correct, he recommended removal of the quarantine on the 8th.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is that in writing too?

The WITNESS: I think so.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is not in the return.

Mr. BENNETT: Let the witness go on.

The WITNESS: About the 12th, I think it was, of December or thereabouts, Wood and Smith, the two neighbours who had helped Waas to medicate his cattle noticed that some of their own were going off their feed and showing the same symptoms and the same conditions, apparently; and they were placed under quarantine observation also.

I believe the next appearance of the trouble was in the Burns feed lot, and that was on the 28th of December. That feed lot was put under quarantine and the infected animals isolated.

In the meantime other cases occurred—a few others—and I would say in all those the report was very mild and typical. There were no really pronounced lesions such as you would expect with foot and mouth disease.

I might say here also that during the more or less epidemic of vesicular stomatitis throughout the west and in Saskatchewan, in the winter of 1938 and 1939,—I know this personally—both Drs. James and Carlson were employed by the department in Saskatchewan. I know that Dr. James particularly saw a great many of those cases of vesicular stomatitis and he was quite familiar with them. I also think that Dr. James saw foot and mouth disease in Europe during the first great war—it was common enough over there and although I would not swear to it I think that he did see it. I saw it there myself.

Later on disease did appear in pretty much of a group down along the Woscana Creek. It was apparently very difficult to find out where it came from but later it transpired that there had been a farmhand employed at the Waas place during the autumn. He left there on the day on which Waas noticed his cattle showing symptoms of this disease. He went over to the bigger dairy herd of Hanley and went to work there.

Mr. ARGUE: Where did he go to work?

The WITNESS: With Hanley.

Mr. DARROCH: What was the date again?

The WITNESS: He left the Waas premises on the 26th and he went to Hanley's on the 27th. I believe he really started to work for Hanley on the 29th.

Ten or twelve days later the odd one of Hanley's cattle began to show this trouble. It was very mild and cleared up so quickly that apparently he did not think it worth while calling in a private practitioner or reporting it anywhere. In fact we knew nothing about it being on those premises at all until I was out there and found out about it on the 19th of February. It had been through his herd—he says not all of them but some of them. Some did not show anything at all, hardly. It was not reported. The cattle came back to milk and so on, but undoubtedly it was the disease.

Well, now, Hanley sold livestock here and there. He sold two calves down south. That accounted for the little outbreak down at Truax—on the Beingsner and Demerse places. Infection of their premises was traced to the two calves—two Holstein heifers.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What date was that?

The WITNESS: I cannot give you the date offhand.

Mr. ARGUE: From the Waas herd?

The WITNESS: No, no, from the Hanley herd.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It would be in February?

The WITNESS: It was February they found it in Truax. The calves had been there for some time—a couple of weeks—and unfortunately the herd of Demerse had mingled with the herd of Beingessner—I would not say which was which—but the result was that the infection got both of them through those two calves.

During all this time there was, of course, quite a bit of milk production by Hanley, but luckily he had a pasteurizing plant and the milk was pasteurized. However, there were other ways of spreading it. There are close neighbours, dogs going back and forth, and brewer's grain or brewer's malt being trucked about and the truck would be in his place and in other places, back and forth. That appears to be the way the infection was spread around there. You will remember that this was never reported to anybody.

The way it was found was through a much smaller herd right in the vicinity which reported something wrong. Dr. James went over to have a look and, when looking them over he was informed that Mr. Hanley had this disease back in December about the 10th or 12th. I think that accounts for most of the spread around there—in fact I am fairly sure it does.

Mr. ARGUE: I wonder if you can give us the dates on which the heifers went to Truax—or approximately the date?

The WITNESS: I cannot do that right out of my head.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: A couple of weeks before the 19th?

The WITNESS: Yes. That would be back in early February.

Mr. BRYCE: The 5th or 6th?

The WITNESS: February 8th—that is eleven days. They might have been of course showing the disease a day or so or more before it was noticed. That accounts for most of the spread there.

Now, keep in mind that at each of these places as they were found to have this trouble instructions were given: Put those premises under close quarantine and observation.

We have always cautioned our men not to use the term "foot and mouth disease" loosely. We know the implications. You gentlemen know now too. We have known for a long time what would be the upshot if you ever said "foot and mouth disease".

We know right well how it would affect international trade and affect the whole national economy. We know that well. However we did not suspect there would be foot and mouth disease up there. It was absolutely preposterous—2,000 miles from anywhere that you would expect it. You would expect it at some of our coasts or at our quarantine stations, but not out there.

However, it did appear there. Why it got there we cannot swear at all. Nevertheless, it is there. Of course, hindsight is much better than foresight but we did not suspect it was foot and mouth disease. We had talked this over—myself, Dr. Hall, Dr. Stewart—those are our senior men. They have had vesicular stomatitis out there before and we thought it must be just the same thing again. We know that vesicular stomatitis is common enough in the States even to this day in certain parts; and it has appeared in the west more than once. However, it is apparent that this was one of the cases where it was not vesicular stomatitis though we have no actual proof that there was not vesicular stomatitis there too and, as I go on, you may see the point why that may be so.

Coming along to my visit out to Saskatchewan in January. There was not enough alarm or anything like that in connection with this vesicular condition to take me out there. It was not that which took me out there at all. I went

out to speak to the livestock men on shipping fever, methods of prevention, cure, and so on. When I got through with them I was slated to meet the poultry people of the west and deal with Newcastle disease. That I did.

Well, we had a look around and it took up a lot of my time—more time than I had allotted. I was not aware I would be required to talk about Newcastle disease when I got out there.

However, we got around and had a look at the Burns feed lot and packing plant and looked over things along with Dr. Carlson, Dr. James, and the veterinarian in charge of the plant, Dr. Dryden.

That would be on the 18th of January. We did not see anything there. As a matter of fact there was nothing to be seen hardly in Burns' feed lot—nothing to lead you to suppose there was anything serious there at all.

We looked around at the carcasses slaughtered, hearts and other portions, and we did see some indications of mild conditions which we put down to mouldy feed, spoiled feed, or something like that. We did not see any foot lesions; we saw a good case of foot rot.

Mr. WRIGHT: Examination was made for lesions?

The WITNESS: Oh, yes. We looked them over sure enough.

We did not see anything there that would indicate seriousness at all and, speaking of your quarantine that was brought out awhile ago, the procedure is this in regard to quarantines.

If a departmental veterinarian finds or suspects that a serious condition exists he has authority to place a quarantine, which he does; and he reports it. He reexamines in due time and if he finds there is no disease and he has been mistaken, or that the disease has been there and eradicated, he recommends removal of the quarantine. He sends that in on a special form—a recommendation to remove quarantine.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Was that sent in?—A. Yes, sir. That is routine.

Q. It is not in the report I got?—A. That is a routine.

Q. I do not care whether it is routine or not, it is not in the return.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Six o'clock.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On the question just raised, I must apologize for not going carefully into this when it was submitted to me as being all the documents. I have just been getting an explanation and I am told that in the House earlier I had said that documents with names of persons were privileged, and I presume that is why Dr. Childs hesitated to give the name of Mr. Waas. They did not put those documents in the return. Now as you appreciate, when I made the statement yesterday I said that everything was in there, and everything must be in the return. It will all be brought down here or in the House, whichever you wish.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Could we get those details at once? You see, Mr. Chairman, I asked for a copy of all the communications which had passed between the veterinary officials, and there is no right in any official in any department selecting this and that letter or any other information and saying that it should not be submitted. We should have the whole return. These documents I am asking for tomorrow. I want to say again that these documents must be here because it is only after examination that you know what is in them. When I got this return all I can say is that there was even less attention to this matter than I had expected it to get.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Apart altogether from the question of whether officials have any right to consider certain communications privileged—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They have not.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: —we will not discuss that now. We are going to give you all the documents. I do not know whether everything is on this file, but most of it is there, and whatever else there is you are going to get. We will try to have it for you tomorrow. I am sorry that we did not have it earlier.

Mr. ARGUE: I wonder if the minister could have several copies of the return made so that more than one member of the committee can have an opportunity of studying it?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: When we get these documents now I hope they will get an unexpurgated edition, that we will have everything.

The CHAIRMAN: The next meeting has been mentioned, and I suggest that, with your consent, we meet again tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. I was going to suggest we sit tonight, but they tell me it is Wednesday night.

Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that witnesses appearing before this committee, like Dr. Childs, giving us the history of this matter should have the story in written form so it can be passed around to members of the committee, and he could read that. I must say that a rambling story of this kind is of very little use to the committee. It is certainly history. It is not evidence. I want to suggest to the witness that if he wants to appear before the committee he should have a written statement giving all of these particulars, and in such form that copies can be passed around to members of the committee so we can follow without interruption.

Mr. BENNETT: On the contrary, I think Dr. Childs' evidence has been very, very, informative.

The CHAIRMAN: It is agreed that we meet at the call of the chair tomorrow at 11 o'clock?

Agreed.

The committee adjourned.

APPENDIX A

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 169 F

TUESDAY, April 29, 1952

Mr. Diefenbaker, M.P.

Address to His Excellency the Governor General for a copy of all communications that passed between veterinary officials either Provincial or Federal and the Federal Department of Agriculture, together with all records since the 17th day of November, 1951, relative to the cattle epidemic of vesicular stomatitis or foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan, also all certificates or statements of analysis showing the results of the chemical examination of suspected specimens of either of said cattle diseases.

Order For Return

See attached.

Department of Agriculture,
Ottawa, April 29, 1952.

Tabled

MR. GARDINER

T. R. MONTGOMERY, C.A.

HEALTH OF ANIMALS

OTTAWA, Ontario, March 3, 1952

Dr. N. D. Christie,
301 Post Office Building, Regina, Sask.

This will acknowledge receipt of Dr. Dryden's report of his investigation of foot and mouth disease in the herd of W. J. Shaw, of Pennant, Sask.

While the disease was not confirmed at this visit, the premises were placed under quarantine.

In view of the number of animals infected and the situation in your province at this time, special attention should be given this herd, that is frequent inspections should be made.

T. CHILDS,

Veterinary Director General

OTTAWA, March 3rd, 1952.

Memorandum to Dr. N. D. Christie, 301 Post Office Bldg., Regina.

The time has arrived to give consideration to the compilation of the monthly disease report which has a very wide distribution.

As our figures of premises *actually infected* up to and including February 29th, 1952, with foot and mouth disease, are not complete in this office, it is requested that you furnish us with a statement showing the number of premises in Saskatchewan which you know were actually infected with foot and mouth disease up to and including February 29th, 1952. Do not include premises quarantined because they are "suspicious" infected premises.

We would also like some figures as to the correct total of all species of animals slaughtered on account of foot and mouth disease up to and including February 29th, 1952. This information is for the monthly activity report.

T. CHILDS,

Veterinary Director General.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, March 3rd, 1952.

Dr. N. D. Christie,
Post Office Building,
Regina, Sask.

Please supply by airmail list of names packing house employees that have been dismissed from packing plants Regina if possible supply by airmail list European immigrants who have left quarantined area as it is understood a number have appeared in Ontario.

T. CHILDS

Chge. H. of A.
Dept. of Agr.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAM

Night Letter
Sent To

OTTAWA

Dr. A. C. Lundie, 441 Post Office Bldg., Moncton, N.B.
Dr. J. N. L. Couture, 131 St. James St. W., Montreal, Que.
Dr. W. Moynihan, 366 Keele Street, Toronto, Ont.
Dr. R. H. Lay, 613 Dominion Public Bldg., Winnipeg, Man.
Dr. N. D. Christie, 301 Post Office Bldg., Regina, Sask.
Dr. H. C. Storey, 403 Public Bldg., Calgary, Alta.
Dr. F. W. B. Smith, 3100 Main Street, Vancouver, B.C.
Dr. I. Christian, Post Office Bldg., South Edmonton, Alta.

Plant Managements to be warned against employing dismissed employees from Burns and Company Limited and Intercontinental Packers Limited Regina Saskatchewan until their clothing including shoes has been disinfected under supervision stop Please acknowledge.

T. CHILDS

Chge. H. of A. Division
Dept. Agriculture.

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASK., March 2, 11.20 p.m. 52

Dr. T Childs Veterinary Director
General Department of Agriculture Ottawa

Second burial completed today at 32 below zero Stop Totals destroyed 149 cattle 14 swine one goat Stop Third burial scheduled Monday morning Stop All burials of presently infected cattle expected to be completed Wednesday evening Stop A total of five trenches to be used

K F WELLS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASK., March, 1 p.m. 8.53

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Building Ottawa

Your memorandum regarding supplies and equipment for collecting material for laboratory examination received and note contents Stop Case at Killdeer investigated by Carlson negative Stop No new cases uncovered

however nine calves and one goat immediate contacts from one premises will be slaughtered Stop No slaughtering today slaughtering tomorrow Stop Investigations and inspections being conducted expeditiously Stop Will phone you tomorrow

N D CHRISTIE

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, March 1, 1952

N D Christie
301 Post Office Bldg
Regina Sask

Expected decision re animals slaughtered is that compensation be based on actual value Stop In view of above keep complete records each animal Stop Any evaluation done to date may be adjusted if found necessary

T CHILDS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASKATCHEWAN, March 1st., A.M. 4.56.

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Bldg., Ottawa Ont.

Two hundred and thirty-eight cattle and sixty-eight sheep destroyed and buried today stop work of destruction by mounted police efficiently carried out stop one more trench ready noon tomorrow stop Dr. Carlson found condition reported suspicious on premises W. J. Shaw Pennant not foot and mouth disease stop suspicious cases at Gravelbourg and Killdeer will be investigated tomorrow stop sixty-six vehicles cleaned and disinfected today at central disinfection station stop must act apply for swine or is commercial value to be allowed stop please reply by immediate wire information needed Saturdays operation.

N. D. CHRISTIE

OTTAWA, February 29, 1952.

Memorandum for: Mr. N. Young, Director.

In accordance with your request the following statement referring to the diagnosis of foot and mouth disease is submitted below:

On February 16th there was received at the Animal Diseases Research Institute, Hull, a specimen composed of tissue and fluids said to have been taken from the tongue of a cow in the region of Regina and which presented evidence of vesicular disease. Inoculations of this material were made into cattle, swine, horse guinea pigs and developing chick embryos. Only the animals susceptible to foot and mouth disease became infected. These presented the classical symptoms of this specific illness. No animal, susceptible only to other forms of vesicular disease, became infected. In addition specific type serum was obtained from England and serological examinations carried out on several different occasions with the result that the virus of foot and mouth disease Type A was identified.

On the basis of the examinations mentioned above it was conclusively demonstrated that the infection in question was caused by the foot and mouth disease virus belonging to the Type A group.

Diagnosis: Foot and Mouth disease caused by Type A.

C. A. MITCHELL,
Chief,
Division of Animal Pathology.

OTTAWA, February 29th, 1952.

Memorandum to district veterinarians:

Supplies and equipment for collecting material for laboratory examination obtained from cattle or other animals suspected of being infected with foot and mouth disease are going forward to your office from the Animal Diseases Research Institute, Hull, P.Q.

Where there is the least suspicion that foot and mouth disease may be present samples from the affected animal or animals should be immediately collected and sent forward to the A.D.R.I., Hull, P.Q., by air express or the most rapid method of transport available for laboratory examination.

All precautions should be taken to ensure the package against breakage en route. When material of this nature has been forwarded for laboratory examination, the Veterinary Director General should be promptly notified by wire of action taken.

Please acknowledge.

T. CHILDS,
Veterinary Director General.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASKATCHEWAN, February 29, A.M. 1.59.

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Bldg., Ottawa Ont.

First organized press conference successfully held stop Gosnell Film Board arrived stop first hole ready for destruction action Friday morning stop two other holes progressing favourably stop disinfection centre started operating stop other than Pennant suspect two more Gravelbourg and Killdeer require special investigation stop field inspection crews in quarantine area started out this morning stop awaiting additional veterinarians to start inspection crews outside area stop quarantine placards placed on all infected premises today by RCMP.

N. D. CHRISTIE

OTTAWA, February 28th, 1952.

Memorandum to Dr. N. D. Christie,
Post Office Building, Regina.

Further to our telephone conversation of yesterday.

It is understood that assistance in the form of manpower is required for manning disinfection stations, etc. and that you have applied to the local Civil Service Commission representative to secure such assistance. As it is quite likely considerable time will elapse before you secure assistance from that source, and having discussed the matter with the Director of Production Service, you are authorized to hire whatever assistance is required from any source available, in order that the work of controlling and eradicating disease may not be delayed. A delay of even a few hours in dealing with an essential feature of the work could well cost the Canadian public many millions of dollars.

It is suggested that men might now be available from Burns & Company Limited staff as Est. 23E is not now in operation.

T. CHILDS,
Veterinary Director General.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA Sask Feb 28 AM 3 17

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Bldg Ottawa Ont

Re telephone conversation today Leader Post photographers on two successive days visited infected quarantined premises as indicated on pages three and one Leader Posts dated February twenty fifth and twenty sixth respectively stop copies of these papers forwarded you today under separate cover stop disinfection centre for trucks ready today operating tomorrow stop slaughtering of livestock commencing tomorrow afternoon stop one suspected premises uncovered at Pennant stop additional details tomorrow stop veterinarians from Ontario briefed on cleansing and disinfecting their clothing and assigned inspection duties in respective municipalities within quarantined area stop mounted police patrolling highways and infected premises.

N. D. CHRISTIE

OTTAWA, Ont., February 28, 1952.

Refer to File 1-16-1

Memorandum to Dr. N. D. Christie,
301 Post Office Bldg., Regina.

Reference is made to your memorandum of February 26, 1952, written and signed by Doctor K. F. Wells, concerning disposal of infected hides presently stored at Regina.

It is obvious that hides from Regina and vicinity, which have not been satisfactorily disinfected cannot be permitted to be moved on account of the danger of disseminating infection, and the effect such procedure would have on public opinion in Eastern Canada where considerable pressure has already developed toward prohibiting movement of all livestock and livestock products from Western to Eastern Canada.

Under these circumstances it will be in order to permit establishment at Regina, subject to your approval, of facilities for disinfecting hides, cost of same to be borne by those concerned.

T. CHILDS,
Veterinary Director General.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA Sask Feb 27 AM 4 15

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Bldg. Ottawa Ont

No new cases established seven sick reports investigated stop arrangements completed with Provincial Department for occupation of highways garage as disinfection centre stop expect to have disinfection centre operation Wednesday pm or Thursday am stop intend channelling all trucks carrying livestock products to city through disinfection centre after each country trip stop PFRA working on first hole expected completed Wednesday with first burial cattle Thursday am stop Shahan and Plummer arrived Regina along with six veterinarians stop have approximately twenty sick calls for attention Wednesday

N. D. CHRISTIE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan,
February 26th, 1952.
Refer to File No. 1-16-1

The Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

The problem has come up of dealing with hides that are at present on quarantined hide premises in the city of Regina, some of which have originated recently from Burns Packing Plant, and also a number of which are on Burns premises.

The local Hide people met with Dr. Christie and I yesterday afternoon and the matter was thoroughly discussed. It appears from a study of the situation that we have the alternative of either paying compensation for these hides and burying them with carcasses, or treating them in accordance with Section 174 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Regulations. This disinfection of the hides, in accordance with the regulations, would put them on the same basis as importing untanned hides from Foot and Mouth infected countries such as the Argentine.

As you are aware, there are no approved hides premises in the city of Regina. The Hide people here would consider the establishing of approved disinfection premises if this privilege were granted to them. The other alternative is to ship the hides in a sealed placarded railway car to an approved hide premises in Eastern Canada.

While the number of hides involved is not actually known, the total value would be considerable, somewhere around \$50,000.

If it is decided that these hides can be processed in accordance with the regulations, it is our opinion that this should be done in the city of Regina, following which we could have them transported in clean, disinfected trucks to disinfected railway cars for shipment East.

It would be appreciated if you would give consideration to this matter and advise us at your earliest convenience.

(sgd) K. F. WELLS

Ottawa, Ontario, February 28, 1952.

Memorandum to Dr. N. D. Christie.
301 Post Office Bldg., Regina.

Referring to your memorandum of February 26, 1952, and confirming our telephone conversation of yesterday concerning reported sickness among cattle in the vicinity of Beechy, Sask.

The difficulty of reaching Beechy, Sask., by ordinary means of travel are appreciated. It will therefore be in order to make whatever arrangements possible with Mr. L. B. Thomson, P.F.R.A., to have a divisional veterinarian proceed by plane to Beechy, Sask., or vicinity.

It will also be in order to make the use of a plane with a reliable pilot to reach any other premises where ordinary means of travel are not feasible or would be excessively time consuming.

T. CHILDS,
Veterinary Director General.

301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan,
February 26th, 1952.
Refer to File No. 1-16-1

The Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

As you were advised over the telephone today, we have received a report of sickness in cattle at Beechy, Sask. The roads to Beechy are entirely blocked. It is possible, as you have suggested, to send a man by train from Saskatoon. However, a trip of this nature by train would take four days and, unfortunately, we have not sufficient staff to permit a man four days for one call. The only other alternative is to have a veterinary officer travel in by light plane. Such transportation is available for rent and can readily be arranged for by Mr. L. B. Thomson, Director, P.F.R.A., who is in the habit of using this mode of travelling.

It is realized that you suggested the call could wait for a few days in the hope that the roads would be open.

It would be appreciated if you would give consideration to the possibility of hiring light planes for emergency calls of this nature. You may rest assured the authority, if given, will not be abused.

(sgd) N. D. CHRISTIE,
District Veterinarian.

301 Post Office Bldg.,
Regina, Sask.,
February 26th, 1952.
Refer to File No. 1-16-1

The Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

With respect to Veterinary Officers' reports dealing with foot and mouth disease, a circular is today going forward to all Veterinarians, advising them that they must forward all reports to this office the day the visit is made.

All such reports will be forwarded to your office immediately they are received and checked at this office.

(sgd) K. F. WELLS

Health of Animals
Division

Production Service
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

301 Post Office Bldg.,
Regina, Saskatchewan,
February 26th, 1952.

The Veterinary Director General—
Ottawa, Ontario.

Mr. E. E. Brockelbank of the Provincial Department of Agriculture is arranging to put at our disposal up to eight (8) automobiles with drivers. These drivers will be familiar with the territory and they will immediately be put out with veterinarians on general inspection.

I am not certain whether it is the intention of the Provincial Department to charge for the services of these men. However, if there is any question of charging, I will ask Mr. H. Horner, Deputy Minister, to take the matter up with you.

(sgd.) K. F. WELLS.

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, February 26, 1952.

Dr. N. D. Christie
District Veterinarian
Canada Department of Agriculture
Post Office Building
Regina, Sask.

Following from Taggart to Thomson Leader Post Regina today quote Agree your proposal photograph disposal and control work re foot and mouth Regina area provided veterinary authorities in charge have complete control of movements of photographer and are satisfied his activities will not increase danger of spreading disease unquote

T. CHILDS

ARMY MESSAGE

OUTGOING

Toronto, Ont., February 26, 1952.

The following left Toronto for Regina by plane from Malton airport on flight one at 9.45 this morning doctors nurse Wardlaw Vaughan Armstrong McKeown Girard Plummer also doctor Shahan of Washington. Please rush advance of \$150 for doctors nurse Vaughan and Armstrong c/o Doctor Christie Regina. Doctor Christie advised by wire of these arrivals.

G. H. COLLACUTT

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

FEB 26 PM 5 47 (42)

YK230 18/17 collect Regina Sask. 26 304P

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confed Bldg. Ottawa

Retel Moose Jaw stockyards quarantine forwarded February twentieth Prince Albert February twenty-third Saskatoon Air Mail today.

Signed: N. D. CHRISTIE

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, February 26, 1952.

Dr. N. D. Christie,
Post Office Building,
Regina, Sask.

Please furnish at close of each day's work following information complete as possible by night letter beginning with today stop daily activities including progress and number of animals slaughtered projected activities for following day new procedures contemplated new cases established suspected cases under investigation incorrect press reports stop confirm by airmail with any added information stop this information required for tomorrow morning and for each day thereafter as daily bulletin to be issued from here.

Signed: T CHILDS

Chg: H. of A.
Dept. of Agr.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, Feb. 26, 1952.

Dr. N. D. Christie,
Post Office Building,
Regina, Sask.

Reports on stock yards and feed lots quarantined with copy of quarantine order should be forwarded air mail to this office—please expedite.

Signed: T. CHILDS

Chge. H. of A.
Dept. of Agr.

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, February 26, 1952.

Dr. N. D. Christie,
District Veterinarian,
301 Post Office Bldg.,
Regina, Sask.

No objection on policy grounds to news photography either still or movie but all who have inquired here have been told that for safety reasons number of people doing such work must be limited and strictly controlled by veterinary officers in charge.

Signed: T. CHILDS

Charge—Health of Animals Division
Dept. of Agriculture
co: Ralph McKay, Mr. Young.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

YE394 13 N M Collect Regina, Sask. 25.
The veterinary director general
776 Confederation Bldg., Ottawa.

Please authorize authority employ two labourer butchers to slash carcasses in pit.

Signed: N. D. CHRISTIE

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Health of animals division.

301 Post Office Bldg.
Regina, Sask.
FEBRUARY 25th, 1952.
Refer to File No. V. D.

To The Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ont.

Attached is a copy of the Radio Address, delivered over C.K.C.K., Regina, Sask. Sunday, February 24th, 1952.

Signed: K. WELLS

RADIO ADDRESS DELIVERED OVER CKCK REGINA SASK.

SUNDAY FEB. 24/52

Much has been written in the past few days respecting the outbreak of Stomatitis.

Following the first reports of the disease to Veterinary officers of the Health of Animals Division preliminary investigations were carried out to ascertain the extent and potential of the disease.

These preliminary investigations indicated the necessity of quarantine measures as a means of limiting the spread of the disease.

The quarantine, Order-in-Council Number 1028, dated February 19, 1952, declares that ruminants or swine may not be moved into the quarantine area or out of the quarantine area. They may not be moved from one place to another within the quarantine area unless both places are owned by the same person.

These same restrictions apply to any flesh, hides hoofs, horns, or other part of any ruminant or swine, or any hay, straw, or other things used for feeding or caring for ruminants or swine, or any cereal grain.

This does not apply in respect to the movement out of the quarantine area of anything in an elevator as defined in the Canadian Wheat Board Act 1935 on the date this Order comes into force.

Provision is made for the direct movement through the quarantine area of ruminants and swine and any of the above mentioned things, by rail if they are not unloaded within the area and if they have not been brought into contact with any ruminants or swine in the area.

The area quarantined comprises the Rural Municipalities of South qu'Appelle 157, Edenwold 158, Sherwood 159, Pense 160, Lumsden 189 and that portion of North qu'Appelle 187 lying south of the qu'Appelle River. This area south of the qu'Appelle River, from Regina Beach on the west to approximately Fort qu'Appelle on the east, with the southern border being a line drawn from approximately Claybank at the west to approximately seven miles east of Bechard.

It can readily be seen that the intention of the Department through this quarantine order is to stop the movement of Livestock and Livestock products in the infected area.

In addition to the above the stock yards at Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert are under individual quarantine. Stock can only be moved out of these yards when consigned for immediate slaughter to a packing plant operating under Federal Veterinary Inspection.

These restrictions on the movement of livestock and livestock products are the very minimum that could be imposed if this disease is to be contained within its present limits.

The true nature of the disease is being carefully investigated at the Animal Diseases Research Institute, Hull, Que. It is not possible to hasten the Laboratory procedure necessary, nor would it be advisable if this were possible. This makes it difficult to anticipate an announcement of Laboratory findings on any particular day.

In addition to the laboratory work at Hull, animal inoculation tests are being conducted in Regina.

CANADA
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Health of animals division.

301 Post Office Bldg.
Regina, Sask.

FEBRUARY 25th, 1952.

To The Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ont.

Attached hereto for your information is a list of shipments of meats and other animal products consigned by Est.23E, Burns & Company, Regina, Sask., to various points throughout Canada.

Please note this list includes shipments made on and after November 16th, up to January 23rd and includes the description of the product and the consignee. After the latter date no shipments were made.

Signed: F. F. SAINT
for N. D. Christie, District Veterinarian.

BURNS AND COMPANY LTD.
Regina, Sask.

Date	Consignee	Car No.	Contents
November 16	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 282700	Beef, 22,481 lb., Fancy 23,59 lb.
November 19	Burns, Winnipeg	C.P. 289800	Beef Hinds, 11,890 lb.
November 20	Burns, Winnipeg	C.P. 282742	Beef Hinds, 11,108 lb.
November 21	Burns, Toronto	C.P. 281449	Beef, 21,864 lbs.; Tenders, 364 lbs.
November 23	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 282694	Beef, 25,923 lbs.; Fancy, 2,095 lbs.
November 23	Canada Packers, Toronto	C.N. 8532	Edible, 61,040 lbs.
November 27	Burns, Toronto	C.P. 282592	Beef, 23,174 lbs.
November 28	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 289590	Beef, 24,511 lbs.
November 29	Davis Leather, Newmarket, Ont.	Trans. Can.	Skins, 547 pc.
November 29	Burns, Toronto	C.P. 282619	Beef, 21,073 lbs.; Fancy, 200 lbs.
November 30	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 282601	Beef, 27,679 lbs.; B'less, 5090 lbs.; Lamb, 1,744 lbs.
December 3	Burns, Prince Albert	C.P. 282444	Beef, 13,110 lbs.
December 5	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 281758	Beef, 26,590 lbs.
December 6	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 282492	Beef CCS, 216,47 lbs.; Lamb, 2,597 lbs.; Tender, 1,428 lbs.
December 7	Burns, Toronto	C.P. 282384	Beef, 24,224 lbs.
December 7	Proctor & Gamble, Toronto, Ont.	C.N. 8599	Inedible, 59,180 lbs.
December 11	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 282728	Beef, 27,076 lbs.
December 18	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 289648	Beef, 23,531 lbs.
December 20	Burns, Toronto	C.P. 282072	Beef, 21,162 lbs.
December 21	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 289823	Beef, 21,028 lbs.
December 24	Nazaire Fortier Inc., Quebec City	C.N. 170811	Hides, 1,175 bdles.; Switches, 4,181
December 27	McDougall Vandura	C.N. 510169	Feeds, 30,810 lbs.
January 5	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 281168	Beef, 25,329 lbs.; B'less, 1,670 lbs.; Fancy, 5,310 lbs.
January 7	Edgar Clement, Quebec City	C.N. 583451	Hides, 954 bdles.
January 8	Burns, Toronto	C.P. 281394	Beef, 21,062 lbs.
January 9	Martin & Stewart, Montreal	C.P. 578814	Hides, 1,176 Bdles.
January 10	Davis Leather, Newmarket, Ont.	Trans. Can.	Skins, 265 bdles.
January 10	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 281023	Beef, 24,851 lbs.
January 11	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 282660	Beef, 25,019 lbs.
January 15	Burns, Windsor Peacocks		Beef, 16,392 lbs.; Fancy, 590 lbs.
January 16	Burns, Montreal	C.P. 281216	Beef, 26,968 lbs.
January 17	Berth Livi Co., Chicago	Soo	Casing, 11,227 pc.
January 17	Benjamin Wishner Security		Hides, 194 bdles.
January 23	Burns, Windsor, Peacocks		Beef, 16,664 lbs.; Veal, 350 lbs.

Date	Consignee	Car No.	Contents
January 23.....	Proctor & Gamble, Toronto.....	C.P. 8737.....	Inedible, 59,460 lbs.
January 25.....	Burns, Montreal.....	C.P. 282635.....	Tenders, 267 lbs.; Fancy, 15,250 lb.
January 25.....	Burns, Montreal.....	C.P. 281588.....	Beef, 23,143 lbs.
January 25.....	Burns, Calgary.....	C.P. 281701.....	Fancy, 1,513 lbs.
January 25.....	Burns, Vancouver.....	C.P. 281701.....	Fancy, 6,121 lbs.; Pork Ribs, 2,800 lbs.
January 30.....	Burns, Montreal.....	C.P. 282349.....	Beef, 20,306 lbs.
January 31.....	Burns, Toronto.....	C.P. 282546.....	Beef, 21,079 lbs.
January 31.....	Burns, Toronto, Peacocks.....		Pork Tenders, 2,850 lbs.; Fancy, 1,350 lbs.
January 31.....	Parke Davis & Co., Walkerville, Ont.....	C.P. 282546.....	Fancy, 88 lbs.
January 31.....	Connaught Laboratories, Toronto.....	C.P. 282546.....	Fancy, 6,240 lbs.
February 1.....	Burns, Prince Albert.....	C.P. 47981.....	Feeds, 30,000 lbs.
February 1.....	Burns, Windsor, Peacocks.....		Beef, 16,335 lbs.
February 5.....	Burns, Montreal.....	C.P. 282486.....	Beef, 26,060 lbs.
February 6.....	Burns, Montreal.....	C.P. 289664.....	Beef, 21,242 lbs.
February 12.....	Anglo Canadian Leather, Huntsville, Ont.....	C.N. 522920.....	Hides and Skins, 1,145 bdles.
February 13.....	Burns, Windsor, Peacocks.....		Beef, 16,094 lbs.
February 13.....	Boars Head Provision Co. Jersey City.....	C.P. 282560.....	Pork Hams, 27,693 lbs.
February 14.....	Presswood Bors.....	C.P. 281322.....	Beef, 21,442 lbs.
February 19.....	Proctor & Gamble, Hamilton, Ont.....	C.P. 8737.....	Inedible, 59,700 lbs.
January 4.....	McCabe Meat Meal.....		10,000 lbs.
January 11.....	McCabe Meat Meal.....		10,000 lbs.
January 15.....	McCabe Meat Meal.....		10,000 lbs.
January 16.....	McCabe Meat Meal.....		10,000 lbs.
January 29.....	McCabe Meat Meal.....		14,000 lbs.
January 23.....	Saskatchewan Federated Co-op Meat Scraps.....		10,000 lbs.

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PRODUCTION SERVICE — HEALTH OF ANIMALS DIVISION

Specimen Record for Inspectors

Identification...No. 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9 Disease suspected..Infectious Stomatitis
 Owner of animal ...Burns & Company Ltd....Abattoir, establishment 23E...
 Address...Regina, Saskatchewan
 Animal Species...Bovine....Approximately 2 yrs.... Sex.....

Clinical history and symptoms...Vesicular and ulcerative lesions on mucous membranes of mouth, tongue and lips with considerable drooling. Swelling of coronary regions in many cases with lameness. Scabby formations on Ante-mortem notes (hours before death) teats frequently noted. Hogs off feed and lane on one farm. Horses and sheep appear resistant. No mortality in cattle or hogs reported excepting very young calves. Condition Post-mortem notes (1 hour after death) date alarmingly contagious. Ulcer formation on pillars of rumen

Specimens: 1. Serum from solitary lesion on tongue. Hemorrhage noted. Possibly traumatic. 2. Serum from vesicle of tongue. Well developed case. 3 & 4. Swabs from vesicles on tongue. 6. Saliva. Specimen....swabs from affected animal. 7. Swab

from interior vesicle. 8. Blood serum. 9. Sections of pillar of rumen showing ulceration. Specimens taken February 13th & 14th, 1952.

Preservative Dry ice..... Container.... Thermos bottle in carton
Forwarded to laboratory, date.... (a) by mail.... (b) by express, Air Express

(Sgd.) E. E. Carlson, F. F. Saint.....
Veterinary Inspector.....

Address.... 301 Post Office Building Regina, Sask.

Date received.... February 16, 1952..... Serial No. M9726-9734.....

Laboratory Report: DATE.... Feb. 25, 1952

The virus of foot and mouth disease (type A) was demonstrated in this material by animal inoculation and complement-fixation methods with specific typing serum.

(Sgd.) RONALD GWATKIN,
Pathologist

(Sgd.) CHAS. A. MITCHELL

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA, Sask., Feb. 25, PM. 9.43.

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Bldg., Ottawa

The following has been exported to the United States from Est. 23E 194 bundles salted green hides to Benjamin Westmer Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin via Security Truck January seventeen stop pork hams frozen 27693 lbs. Boars Head Provision Company, 232 Hudson Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. CP282560 February thirteen stop beef and hog casings 25 tierces 14233 lbs. Berth Levi Company 3944-486 Hamilton Avenue, Chicago, Ill., Soo Truck January seventeen.

N. C. CHRISTIE

Health of Animals
Division

Production Service

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OTTAWA, Ont., February 23, 1952

Memorandum to Veterinarians throughout Canada

A vesicular disease affecting cattle other ruminants and swine has appeared in Regina, Saskatchewan and vicinity. The true nature of the disease has not been fully proven. However, certain aspects of the disease indicate it is of a more serious nature than ordinary Vesicular Stomatitis. Accordingly, as a precautionary measure certain areas at Regina, Saskatchewan and vicinity have been placed under quarantine in addition to individual quarantine of premises where the disease has been found.

In addition certain restrictions have been placed on movement of livestock and fresh or frozen meats which originate in or near the area where the disease is known or suspected to exist.

All practising veterinarians in Canada are requested to be on the alert for symptoms of vesicular disease among livestock, and if symptoms of vesicular disease are noted, immediately report same to the nearest Departmental Veterinarians or the Departmental District Veterinarian. Samples for laboratory examination must not under any circumstances be collected unless authorized by the Veterinary Director General. Your fullest cooperation is requested.

T. CHILDS,
Veterinary Director General

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASK. Feb. 23, 9.24 p.m.

Dr. T. Childs
Veterinary Director General
137 Huron Ave.
Ottawa.

Shahan arriving Ottawa flight three four zero Sunday 9 am.

K. WELLS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASK. Feb. 23 p.m. 8.26

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Bldg Ottawa

Investigation at Odessa in rural municipality of Francis number 127 proved negative stop all other investigations made yesterday and today also negative stop reports will be mailed February 25th.

N. D. CHRISTIE

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASK. Feb. 23 p.m. 1.13

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Bldg Ottawa

Retel arranging use part time veterinarians southern Saskatchewan starting monday morning stop necessary rubber equipment coveralls and disinfectant being ordered.

K. WELLS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, February 23, 1952

Dr. K. F. Wells
301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan

Retel will be in order review status quarantined area through Radio Station CKCK advise of progress pending final laboratory report.

T. CHILDS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASK. Feb. 22, p.m. 2.15

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation Bldg. Ottawa

Requested by Radio Station CKCK deliver Sunday afternoon five minute review general status quarantine area with explanations stop program is weekly review Regina and Saskatchewan News stop please advise.

WELLS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

Night Letter

OTTAWA, Feb. 22, 1952.

Dr. N. D. Christie,
301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan.

Utilize services of all part time veterinarians your District for inspection susceptible animals STOP Should be properly briefed and required to supply a daily report STOP Area to be covered by each man to be clearly designated STOP Expedite and acknowledge by wire immediately.

T. CHILDS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Health of Animals

OTTAWA, February 22, 1952.

Night Letter (C.N.)
to

Dr. N. D. Christie,
District Veterinarian,
Post Office Building,
Regina, Sask.

Utilize services of all part-time veterinarians your District for inspection susceptible animals STOP Should be properly briefed and required to supply a daily report STOP Area to be covered by each man to be clearly designated STOP Expedite and acknowledge by wire immediately

T. CHILDS

Veterinary Director General

Same to:

Dr. R. H. Lay,
District Veterinarian,
613 Dominion Public Building,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.
(Telephoned)
T.C.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
CANADA

Health of Animals Division

Production Service

301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan,
February 22nd, 1952.

Confidential
The Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Inspectors not needed for country calls are being detailed for road patrol within the quarantine area. No infractions of the quarantine have to date been reported by these men. However, a number of empty farm trucks have been stopped and the quarantine situation discussed with the drivers.

Mr. Brockelbank of the Provincial Department of Agriculture has placed two men on road patrol work and they have not as yet reported any infractions of the quarantine.

We would like to start farm to farm inspections surrounding known infected premises. However, inasmuch as our present staff of veterinary officers have all freely visited infected premises, we are withholding any general farm to farm inspection program.

(Sgd) K. F. WELLS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan,
February 22nd, 1952.

The Veterinary Director General—Ottawa, Ontario.

Considerable thought has been given to the material and services which will be urgently needed, should it become necessary to start operations for the eradication of disease. I would like to stress that in making inquiries the underlying purpose has not been disclosed and no commitments whatsoever have been made.

1. Adequate supplies of unslaked lime have been located. This is packed in 60 lb. bags.
2. Adequate supplies of lye for disinfecting purposes is assured, however, such supplies are limited to 1 lb. cans. It is hoped that if it becomes necessary to purchase this material, arrangements can quickly be made to obtain it in large containers.
3. Post-mortem knives for the slashing of carcasses are readily available.
4. Barn No. 9 at the Exhibition Grounds, which is now under lease to the Livestock Division, Production Service, has been offered to us by Mr. Hooper Coles as warehouse space and a base for field operations. Mr. Coles is agreeable to provide this space without authority from his Chief in Ottawa, Mr. Peterson. It might be wise, however, to clear this matter with Mr. Peterson.
5. Mr. Hooper Coles has agreed, providing again of course that Mr. Peterson and yourself are in agreement, to head up a valuation crew. Mr. Coles has two additional men in his own office who are also able valuers of livestock. Should we wish to use Provincial Officials for this work some of these who are quite capable are also available.

6. Mr. L. B. Thomson, Director, P.F.R.A., has available a number of warble fly spray machines, with 400 gallon capacity and up to 600 lbs. pressure. These machines, Mr. Thomson has assured me, will be readily available. While Mr. Thomson is agreeable, in the case of an emergency, to turn these machines over to us, he would appreciate having authority to do so from his Ottawa superiors.
7. The problem of excavation is a serious one inasmuch as the ground is frozen solid. Here again Mr. L. B. Thomson of P.F.R.A. has agreed to provide or make arrangements for all the necessary equipment and make available his staff for the supervision of this work. Mr. Thomson discussed the matter with Mr. Beamish, his Senior Equipment Man, and has agreed that Mr. Beamish can head up a crew to handle arrangements for all excavations. If you are in agreement, should it become necessary, Mr. Thomson would appreciate clearance in this matter from his Ottawa superiors.
8. Arrangements for the procurement of necessary rubber equipment can be made here on very short notice. Such supplies can be moved in overnight by the Gutta Percha Rubber Company from Winnipeg.
9. Trucks are also available for P.F.R.A. under the same arrangements as excavation equipment.

Again, I stress, that commitments are not being made but it is felt that we must have sources of all equipment and services readily available. This work is continuing and you will be further advised.

(sgd.) K. F. WELLS.

Health of Animals
Division

Production Service

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan,
February, 22nd, 1952.

The Veterinary Director General—Ottawa, Ontario.

I should like first of all to correct my memorandum of yesterday. There are twenty-two (22) premises under quarantine on which infection has been found.

On the 22 infected premises, the total livestock involved is as follows:

Cattle	1,015
Swine	193
Horses	71
Sheep	140

The following list shows the nine Rural Municipalities under the present quarantine with the number of occupied farms in each municipality, as of

the 1946 Census. The number of cattle in each municipality is also shown. The cattle numbers are taken from the tuberculosis test records.

No. of Occupied Farms	No. of Cattle
R.M. No. 157-498	5,169
No. 158-499	3,997
No. 159-371	2,489
No. 160-358	2,769
No. 189-352	3,990
No. 187-235	2,500
No. 128-407	1,667
No. 129-330	717
No. 130-366	1,324
	<hr/>
	24,622

With respect to R.M. No. 187, the figure of 2,500 cattle is estimated as being the number in that municipality south of the Qu'Appelle River.

Signed: K. WELLS.

Health of Animals Division

Production Service

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan.
February 22nd, 1952.

The Veterinary Director General—Ottawa, Ontario.

Milk and cream cans originating within the quarantine area and coming to Dairies and Creameries within the quarantine area were realized to be a source of danger in the spread of infection, and Mr. E. E. Brockelbank, Director of the Provincial Animal Industry Branch, was contacted concerning this matter.

It has been ascertained from Mr. Brockelbank that all such cans are steamed inside from two to three minutes with a strong soda solution at a temperature of at least 170°. Mr. Brockelbank has agreed and in fact has already detailed Provincial Dairy and Creamery Inspectors to visit all these plants within the quarantine area to check on this procedure, and in addition, to arrange for the thorough steaming of the outside of all such cans before they leave the Dairy.

Livestock are moving from the Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert Stockyards, which are under quarantine, but not within the general quarantine area. Stock is permitted to move from these yards for immediate slaughter only at inspected establishments and must, of course, proceed direct. In order to assure that Dr. Lay is advised of all such shipments coming into Winnipeg, where all have been consigned, the inspectors in charge at the stockyards at Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert have been asked to notify Dr. Lay by wire of the railway car numbers leaving their yards and consigned for slaughter at Winnipeg.

Signed: K. WELLS

STANDING COMMITTEE

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Health of Animals

301 Post Office Bldg.,
Regina, Sask.
February 22nd, 1952.

To:

The Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

The test animals at the Provincial Legislative Grounds have been examined today and all have been found perfectly normal. Daily examinations of these animals will be conducted.

Signed: K. WELLS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

Dr. F. K. Wells,
301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan.

OTTAWA, February 23, 1952.

Supplementary animal inoculation approved Stop Farm to farm inspections quarantined area and elsewhere is urgent Stop See telegram Christie concerning parttime veterinarians Stop Additional staff will be transferred Regina soon

T. CHILDS

Chge. H. of A. Div.
Dept. Agric.

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPHS

REGINA, SASK., 22, February 23, 3:55 a.m., '52

RAA26

56 Collect N1

Dr. T. Childs,

Veterinary Director, General Dept. of Agric., Ottawa.

Suggest you phone Storey re stomatitis southern Alberta Stop In view lack of developments test animals here will you approve supplementary animal inoculations here Stop Unless negative decision received near future I feel general farm to farm inspection in quarantine area urgent Stop Additional staff needed if farm to farm inspection instituted Stop Please advise

K. WELLS

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Health of Animals Division

301 Post Office Bldg.,
Regina, Sask.,
February 21st, 1952.

To Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Since your departure from Regina last evening, we have not received any additional country calls reporting new infection. All calls to date have been visited, and where any evidence of Stomatitis was found, the premises have been quarantined.

To date, there are 23 premises under quarantine.

Under separate cover, two reports have been forwarded reporting infection on two premises in the Rural Municipality of Elmsthorpe No. 100, which is at present outside the quarantine area.

Arrangements are being made to have veterinarians include in the location of the diseases premises the name and number of the Rural Municipality.

KFW:HZ

Signed: K. WELLS

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Health of Animals Division

301 Post Office Bldg.,
Regina, Sask.,
February 21st, 1952.

To The Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Under separate cover, we are forwarding a map of the province of Saskatchewan showing in red all infected premises.

This includes all premises up to and including Thursday, February 21st. Total of 23 premises.

KFW/HZ

Signed: K. F. WELLS

Health of Animals Division

Production Service

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

301 Post Office Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan,
February 21st, 1952.

The Veterinary Director General,
776 Confederation Bldg.,
Ottawa, Ont.

The Intercontinental Packing Company broke quarantine today by selling hides to the Isman Hide and Fur Company.

On investigation, it was found that this was not intentional on the part of Intercontinental, but merely a misunderstanding. Intercontinental have no hide curing cellars of their own and they have to dispose of hides daily. This matter has now been cleared with Intercontinental and they have a clear understanding of their quarantine.

Because of the above situation, it was realized the Hide Companies in Regina were a source of danger and arrangements have been made to put all such firms under strict quarantine.

These reports will follow.

KFW/HZ

Signed: K. F. WELLS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

YK122 9 Collect—Regina, Sask., 21 1121A, Feb. 21 P.M. 1.48.

The Veterinary Director General,
776 Confederation Bldg., Ottawa.

Shahan arrived this morning will return via Ottawa.

Signed: K. WELLS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA, SASK. Feb. 20 pm 4 47

Dr. Orland Hall,
Asst Vet. Director General,
Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont.

Saskatoon & Prince Albert stock yards and feed lots placed under quarantine as a precautionary measure to prevent livestock moving east.

T. CHILDS.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

CHICAGO ILL Feb. 19 pm 7 32

Dr. T. Childs
Hotel Saskatchewan
Regina, Sask.

Grounded in Chicago hope catch TCA from Winnipeg tomorrow pm.

SHAHAN

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPHS

WASHINGTON, DC Feb. 19 11 54 am '52

Dr. T. Childs
care Saskatchewan Hotel
Regina, Sask.

Dr. Shahan arrive Regina February 20 TCA Flight No. 151 8 45 am.

SIMMS

Bureau of Animal Industry

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASK Feb 19 pm 5 03

Dr. Orland Hall
Assistant Veterinary Director General
Dept. of Agriculture
Ottawa, Ont.

Moose Jaw stock yards and adjacent feed lots being placed under quarantine this afternoon as a precautionary measure.

T. CHILDS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA, SASK. Feb. 19 am 10 19

Dr. Orland Hall
Assistant Veterinary Director General
Dept. of Agriculture
Ottawa, Ont.

Movement livestock and meat from Saskatchewan and Manitoba to United States and Eastern Canada should be prohibited forthwith Stop move quickly Stop Acknowledge.

CHILDS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

WASHINGTON DC Feb 18 pm 3 16

Dr. T. Childs
care Saskatchewan Hotel
Regina, Sask.

Dr. Shahan will arrive Regina Wednesday will wire you exact time later.

SIMMS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

WINNIPEG Man Feb. 18 pm 3 35

Dr. T. Childs,
Veterinary Director General,
care Dr. N. D. Christie,
301 Post Office Bldg., Regina.

Retel vesicular disease Regina area stop all officers concerned being alerted.

Dr. R. H. LAY,
District Veterinarian

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

301 Post Office Building,
REGINA, Sask., February 18/52

Dr. R. H. Lay,
613 Dominion Public Bldg.,
Winnipeg, Man.

Vesicular disease cattle Regina and vicinity very suspicious stop alert your officers to closely inspect all cattle in public stock yards and packing plant stock yards at Winnipeg and St Boniface and take all possible precautions if anything suspicious is noted stop please acknowledge.

T. CHILDS

Office of the Director

Production Service

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OTTAWA, February 19, 1952.

Dr. T. Childs,
Veterinary Director General,
c/o Dr. N. D. Christie,
613 Dominion Public Building,
Regina, Sask.

Dear Dr. Childs:

This will acknowledge your telegram of February 18th as follows:

Clinical evidence amply justifies quarantine livestock rural municipalities indicated below for suspected infectious and contagious disease stop Ministerial Order should be issued immediately establishing quarantine prohibiting movement of livestock out of and into quarantined municipalities except through shipments proceeding by rail which must not be unloaded within quarantine municipalities stop rural municipalities South Qu'Appelle No. 157 Edenwold 158 Sherwood 159 Pense 160 Lumsden 189 North Qu'Appelle 187 that portion only South of the Qu'Appelle waters stop will telephone about eleven am Monday.

In this connection there is an Order in Council enclosed bearing today's date which is prepared in a manner to conform as closely as possible to your request.

You will note that in addition to the municipalities which you named 127, 128, 129 and 130 have been added. This is due to the fact that you reported by telephone today that there were two suspicious cases some sixteen or eighteen miles south of Regina.

The Order as you will note restricts the movement without the permission of the Veterinary Director General of any ruminants or swine

- (i) into the quarantine area
- (ii) out of the quarantine area, or
- (iii) from one place in the quarantine area to another place in the quarantine area, unless both places are owned or occupied by the same person.

The same applies to the movement out of the quarantine area, or from one place in the quarantine area to another place in the quarantine area, unless both places are owned or occupied by the same person of any flesh, hides, hoofs, horns or other parts of any ruminants or swine, or any hay, straw, fodder or other things used for feeding or caring for ruminants or swine, or any cereal grain.

You will note that the Council has imposed the restrictions which they think are necessary under the conditions which you have reported to prevent the spread of the disease which is suspected, but has given you authority to modify those restrictions where considered necessary.

Further, you will note that any permission given by you for the movement of livestock or products and the like may be general or particular and that you may authorize any inspector to give such permission on your behalf.

Yours very truly,

(sgd) N. YOUNG
Director

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPHS

REGINA, SASK. FEB. 18 7 29 am '52

Mr. N. Young
Director Production Service
Dept. of Agric. Ottawa

Clinical evidence amply justifies quarantine livestock rural municipalities indicated below for suspected infectious and contagious disease stop ministerial order should be issued immediately establishing quarantine prohibiting movement of livestock out of and into quarantined municipalities except through shipments proceeding by rail which must not be unloaded within quarantine municipalities stop rural municipalities South Qu'Appelle #157 Edenwold 158 Sherwood 159 Pense 160 Lumsden 189 North Qu'Appelle 187 that portion only south of the Qu'Appelle waters stop will telephone about eleven am Monday

T. CHILDS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

YAO43 78
OTTAWA, ONT.

FEB. 15, 1952.

PHONED

Dr. N. D. Christie
2827 Regina Avenue
Regina, Sask.

Understand Doctor Hall in collaboration with Doctor Mitchell has issued instructions for collection and forwarding to laboratory Hull material from animals suffering from infectious vesicular condition stop those instructions definitely countermanded stop definite diagnosis must be made on premises where disease exists stop understand another horse has been inoculated stop hold quarantines tight and await results horse inoculations stop self on statutory leave when instructions collect material for laboratory examination issued by Doctor Hall stop wire acknowledgment immediately

T. CHILDS

Veterinary Director General.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

Regina, Sask.
301 Post Office Bldg.
Feb. 14, 1952.

Dr. C. A. Mitchell
Chief
Division of Animal Pathology
Animal Diseases Research Institute,
Mountain Road
Hull, Que.

Retel Assistant Veterinary Director General stop vesicular specimens forwarded air express today

E. E. CARLSON

Asst. District Veterinarian.

OTTAWA, FEBRUARY 13, 1952

Dr. N. D. Christie, 301 Post Office Building, Regina, Sask.

This will confirm my telegram of today's date as follows:

Reference telephone conversation Carlson yesterday please collect material from vesicular lesions ship laboratory study Hull Quebec Carlson understands procedure follow outlined course Animal Diseases Research Institute last spring stop writing.

In this connection you are advised that the study of vesicular disease in Saskatchewan was discussed yesterday with Dr. Mitchell when he pointed out that nothing would be gained by sending an officer from the Research Institute to examine the livestock involved. He was more concerned in the collection of specimens for diagnostic purposes and consequently I am enclosing copy of a communication which was received from Dr. Mitchell together with the procedure to be followed in collection, preservation and shipping of specimens.

You will recall that Dr. Carlson attended the course last spring at the Animal Diseases Research Institute and therefore should be thoroughly conversant with the procedure to be followed. Nevertheless the enclosed will serve as a guide.

Please keep us advised fully with regard to the occurrence of the disease, the rapidity of spread and any new developments which are observed.

OLRAN HALL

Assistant Veterinary Director General.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, February 13, 1952

Day Letter
Dr. N. D. Christie
301 Post Office Building
Regina Saskatchewan

Reference telephone conversation Carlson yesterday please collect material from vesicular lesions ship laboratory study Hull Quebec Carlson understands procedure follow outlined course Animal Diseases Research Institute last spring stop writing

ORLAN HALL

Science Service

Division of
Animal Pathology

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal Diseases Research Institute
Hull, Que.

FEBRUARY 12, 1952.

Dr. Orlan Hall,
Health of Animals Division,
Department of Agriculture,
Ottawa.

Dear Dr. Hall:—

I am attaching suggestions for the collection of material from vesicular lesions to be shipped for laboratory study.

I may add that it is quite likely that Dr. Carlston has this at hand because we went thoroughly into the collection of material at the Course which was put on here last spring. Because the majority of those attending took notes it would seem likely that he already has the information. However, the material is attached.

Collection, Preservation and Shipping of Specimens

The specimens of choice in descending order are—

1. Vesicular fluid.
2. Necrotic tissue from a recent lesion.
3. Desquamated tissue from the surface of the tongue and bucal mucosa.
4. A sample of peripheral blood. It would be advisable to include this from all animals sampled.

Collection—

The vesicular fluid is most easily collected by the use of a needle and syringe. The tissue can be removed by forceps, scissors or curette.

Preservation—

As soon as collected all specimens should be frozen. If Lusteroid tubes or thin walled glass test tubes are available for the collection of the specimens, these can be placed for a few minutes in a mixture of one-half to one pound of dry ice in a quart of alcohol (anti-freeze variety). Freezing will be complete in approximately 5 minutes. If the above containers are not available and ordinary blood bottles or tubes must be used, it will be necessary to freeze the specimens in a mixture of ordinary ice and salt. (Thick glass will not stand the low temperatures of dry ice and alcohol.)

Shipping—

Lusteroid tubes stoppered with ordinary corks can be placed in a vacuum jar with dry ice, the cork of the latter to be inserted but loosely. If these containers are not available then the above mentioned one-half ounce glass bottles or tubes should be packed in a suitable container with dry ice, if available, if not ordinary ice and sawdust, and shipped in a leak proof container via the quickest available means of delivery (air express preferable.)

Note—Instruments and containers should be sterile.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

Day Letter

OTTAWA, January 4, 1952.

Dr. N. D. Christie
301 Post Office Building
Regina, Sask.

Awaiting Doctor James' report vesicular stomatitis Burns Feed Lots Regina reported wire December twenty eighth stop long delay not understood please expedite repeat please expedite.

T. CHILDS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

OTTAWA, December 29, 1951.

Dr. N. D. Christie
301 Post Office Building
Regina, Sask.

Retel make certain no livestock leaves Burns feed lots except for immediate slaughter at Burns Packing Plant stop if possible ascertain source infection.

T. CHILDS

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

REGINA SASKATCHEWAN, December 28, 8.06 P.M.

The Veterinary Director General
776 Confederation bldg., Ottawa Ont.

One hundred and thirty seven steers and seventy heifers of which thirty head are exhibiting symptoms of infectious vesicular stomatitis in Burns and Co Feed Lots Establishment Twenty Three E stop premises quarantined and report by Dr. N. V. James being mailed to you stop healthy animals allowed to be slaughtered.

N. D. CHRISTIE

APPENDIX B

PHA 46

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PRODUCTION SERVICE—HEALTH OF ANIMALS DIVISION

REPORT OF INSPECTOR

UNDER THE ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT, 1903

R.S.C. 1927

INFORMATION ON WHICH ACTION WAS TAKEN Burns & Co. Ltd. D. Regina, Sask. reported sick cattle in their stockyards.

DATE OF VISIT Dec 28th, 1951. TIME OCCUPIED S Part 1 day.

LOCATION OF DISEASED ANIMAL Burns & Co. Stockyards, Regina, Sask.

OWNER'S NAME Burns & Co. Ltd. P.O. Regina, Sask.

NATURE OF DISEASE Suspected Infectious Vesicular Stomatitis in Cattle.
ACTION TAKEN Instructed by Dr. N. D. Christie, District Veterinarian, Regina, Sask. I visited above premises and inspected 207 cattle in feed lots and pens and found 30 of these cattle were exhibiting symptoms of Stomatitis, slobbering considerable amounts of saliva from the mouths, difficulty in drinking and inability to feed properly, temperatures slightly elevated and stiffness in gait when walking. I placed premises under quarantine but made arrangements for the ante-mortem inspection of cattle about to be slaughtered and the thorough cleansing and disinfection of yards, pens, and equipment. I also instructed the plant management to allow no visitors or other persons to enter the quarantined premises and also instructed them that no cattle would be tested or permits issued to allow cattle to be removed until further notice. Treatment was prescribed for the sick cattle the same as was prescribed for the diseased herds of Mr. L. T. Wass, Mr. L. Wood, and Mr. J. C. Smith which herds are now completely recovered and released from quarantine, daily visits will be made to the premises of Burns & Co. and inspection will be made and treatment supervised.

P.H.A. Forms 49 and 59 are attached.

145 Sheep and Lambs—and 50 Hogs all appeared healthy.

At the present time the source of infection is not known but efforts will be made to trace the source if possible.

	Horses	Cattle	Sheep	Swine
Number of animals on premises.....	2	207	145	50
Number of animals infected.....	Nil	30	Nil	Nil
Number of animals died.....	"	Nil	"	"
Number of animals destroyed.....	"	"	"	"

Date of Report Dec. 28th, 1951

(Sgd) N. V. James,

Inspector

N.D.C.

Form PHA 49

CANADA
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
PRODUCTION SERVICE—HEALTH OF ANIMALS DIVISION
DECLARATION BY INSPECTOR
under the
ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT, R.S.C., 1927

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE EXAMINED 137 - 2 year old feeder steers and 70 yearling and 2 year old heifers 145 sheep and lambs and 50 hogs ON THE PREMISES OF Burns & Co. Ltd.

AT their stockyards

Regina, Sask. P.O., AND SAID TO BELONG TO OR TO BE IN CHARGE OF the above owners AND suspect
THE SAID cattle TO BE SUFFERING FROM AN INFECTIOUS AND CONTAGIOUS DISEASE KNOWN AS Infectious Vesicular Stomatitis

THE SAID cattle are HEREBY ORDERED TO BE held in quarantine until released by a Veterinarian of the Federal Dept. of Agriculture AND THE SAID PREMISES MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS cattle yards and pens 150 feet x 75 feet and 60 feet x 60 feet AND ALL UTENSILS, ARTICLES AND THINGS WHICH HAVE BEEN IN CONTACT WITH THE SAID ANIMALS ARE HEREBY ORDERED TO BE THOROUGHLY CLEANSED AND DISINFECTED AND THE SAID PREMISES WITH ALL LANDS AND BUILDING CONTIGUOUS THERETO IN THE SAME OCCUPATION ARE HEREBY DECLARED TO BE AN INFECTED PLACE UNTIL DECLARED TO BE FREE FROM INFECTIOUS OR CONTAGIOUS DISEASE BY ORDER OF THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. AND I GIVE NOTICE THAT FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS ORDER MAY BE FOLLOWED BY PROSECUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT (R.S.C. 1927). SEE SECTIONS ENDORSED HEREON.

(Sgd) N. V. JAMES
Inspector.

DATED AT Regina, Sask. THIS 28th DAY OF December 1951.

To be issued in duplicate, one copy to be served on the owner or person in charge of the animals or premises dealt with, the other to be forwarded to the Veterinary Director General.

CANADA
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
PRODUCTION SERVICE—HEALTH OF ANIMALS DIVISION

LICENCE FOR REMOVAL OF ANIMALS FROM INFECTED PLACE

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF "THE ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT, R.S.C., 1927".

Burns and Co. Ltd., Regina, Sask.

IS HEREBY PERMITTED TO REMOVE FROM OUT OF THE INFECTED PLACE KNOWN AS feed lots and pens at the Company's Stockyards, Regina, Sask., wagons for hauling feed and manure in the yards—"also all cattle which are free from symptoms of disease, for immediate slaughter at the time of Anti-Mortem Inspection." All vehicles, equipment and boots and clothing of attendants to be thoroughly cleansed and disinfected each day and no person excepting regular staff of employees to enter or leave yards, and no cattle to be tested or removed from premises until further notice.

DATED AT Regina, Sask. THIS 28th DAY OF December 1951.

(Sgd) N. V. JAMES
Inspector.

To be issued in duplicate, one copy to be served on the owner or person in charge of the animals or premises dealt with, the other to be forwarded to the Veterinary Director General.

HD
1781
A38
1952
No 2
(HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.)

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

No. 2

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1952

WITNESSES:

The Right Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture;
Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, Department of
Agriculture.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., F.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1952



MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, May 1, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Arsenault, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Darroch, Decore, Diefenbaker, Dumas, Fair, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jutras, Kickham, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), MacKenzie, MacLean (*Queens*), Major, Masse, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Welbourn, White (*Middlesex East*), Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: The Right Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture; Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Gardiner tabled further reports, correspondence, etc., relating to the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Examination of Dr. Childs was continued.

At one o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 4 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Darroch, Decore, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kickham, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, MacLean (*Queens*), Major, Masse, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliams, Murray (*Oxford*), Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Welbourn, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: The Right Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture; Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, Department of Agriculture.

Examination of Dr. Childs was continued.

On motion of Mr. Murray (*Cariboo*), at 6 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 8 o'clock p.m. this day.

EVENING SITTING

The Committee resumed at 8 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Blue, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Darroch,

Decore, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kickham, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacLean (*Queens*), Major, Masse, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Richard (*St. Maurice-Lafleche*), Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Welbourn, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: The Right Honourable J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture; Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, Department of Agriculture.

Examination of Dr. Childs was continued.

Mr. Cruickshank moved that the Committee adjourn until tomorrow.

And the question having been put on the said motion, it was negatived.

On motion of Mr. Decore, at 10.10 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

MAY 1, 1952

11:00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: If you will kindly come to order we will continue with the inquiry. I think probably Mr. Gardiner has a word to say before we call on Dr. Childs.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, last night I intimated, after listening to discussions which were going on yesterday afternoon, that I was quite aware of the fact that you had not everything on the table that I had intended the night before should be on the table, and I stated that I would have these files made up and put on the table of the House today, or here in the committee. Now, they will be here. I have one in my hand which you can see is much thicker than the one you have. I just wish to call your attention to the fact that the reason that these other documents are not on the file is because of discussions we had in the House on the 4th of March. You will recall when I started to read the document which had names in it that Mr. Coldwell, leader of the C.C.F. party, asked me if it was necessary to do that, to put these names on the record, and that question was discussed for some little time in the House and it was determined that it was not necessary and was not advisable to do that. When you read that you will find that it was suggested that eventually it should be tabled; it would be quite proper to table it; but I gave the instructions at the time to my own officials that they were not to put in front of me, when I was taking information to the House, documents that included the names used. Now, the document I was reading from at the moment this discussion took place had in it the names of all the persons whose cattle had stomatitis; I was to go on and read all the names of those who had received animals or meat from the area, and we thought it unwise to have that information spread around for obvious reasons. Now, that is all in this file, everything of that kind is here and I intended the night before last when I mentioned it in the House that everything would be on the file tabled. Yesterday the file I put on the table of the House did not have these particular documents on it. They are all here now, and I am going to leave them with the committee; as I said in the House the other night, I am going to leave it with the committee to determine what they think should be mentioned in the way of names and all that kind of thing publically. You can quite understand, there are butchers who receive meat that probably came from this same Burns plant; it was distributed to some parts of Canada, and it may have been distributed outside and inside the area. The beef wherever it went was probably suitable for human consumption and distribution, but the mere fact that it came from the Burns plant is going to leave some impression with some people. If the committee want to see these on the record I am not going to say that it should not be so, but I think that some consideration should be given, when using these documents, to the effect that they may have upon others. I am going to see in just a few minutes, as soon as the material comes in here, that a sufficient number of these documents are available so they may be used among the three groups. I have already given a copy to Mr. Diefenbaker and we are about to have an additional supply here, not enough for each member of the committee, but one for Mr. Argue, of the C.C.F. group, and another half dozen or so for others are available. I hope to be able to keep one myself for the time being;

but steps are being taken to get out enough copies to spread them out more widely than that. I hope we can go on with the full documents—as a matter of fact, my own copy has just arrived. This sheet (displaying large statements) has the records that were being asked for yesterday, records from the Burns plant. There is a lot of information on there that you probably do not want, but some that you do want. Have you a copy of this, Mr. Diefenbaker?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Not yet.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You will get a copy of it. There is another small one here that I am not sure—I do not think you have a copy of this either.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: This is something you were talking about yesterday.

"This has reference to your memorandum of February 26, and Forms PHA-114 in duplicate, containing an inventory of all meats in storage at both Establishment 23E—Burns & Co. Limited, Regina, and in outside storage for their account, which you returned to this office for signature of the management of Est. 23E.

The desired signatures have been obtained and I am returning the report herewith."

That covers every lot of meat put through the plant during that period. Most of what we were asked for yesterday is on this document, and it is in this connection that I have been speaking. Here is one very small shipment—the check shows that it went to such and such a place, and so on. That is another document that is being tabled. Then there is this larger one which has all the communications from one official in the department to another, from the time of the Waas outbreak on the 2nd of December, when our man first went out there. The report is right up to March 12. And then, if the committee desires it from March 12 on, well, they can be made available to you.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, first I want to refer again to a question of privilege, to the order of the House that was read:

"for a copy of all communications that passed between veterinary officials either provincial or federal and the federal Department of Agriculture, together with all records since the 17th day of November, 1951, relative to the cattle epidemic of vesicular stomatitis or foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan, also all certificates or statements of analysis showing the results of the chemical examination of suspected specimens of either of said cattle diseases."

Now then, the minister, when he brought the documents before the House said (on page 1683):

"I am quite prepared to table all the documents, but I want to go on record as saying that I am tabling documents which are usually privileged in this House."

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I rise to say is this: no file can be expurgated, excised, or the document selected by anyone, once an order of the House has taken place. I intend to raise this question in the House and I am merely giving notice at the moment; because the file as laid before us at the present time displays an entire absence of any communication ever having passed between the deputy minister, between Dr. Childs or anyone in Ottawa, and these men on the field. Not one communication is shown between Dr. Christie and the director of veterinary services in Ottawa, or the deputy minister. And I ask that they make a further search, either in the top secret documents or in the bottom drawer documents; for what is filed today is meaningless. All

that has been placed additional in the record today is simply reports of the inspectors to Ottawa; not one word, not one direction, not one line from any official in Ottawa regarding the matter, even after it was suspected that there might be foot-and-mouth disease.

Furthermore, I point out that as yet there has been no return of the certificates or statements of analyses showing the results of the chemical examinations of suspected specimens of either of the cattle diseases. What was asked for and what is being filed now in parliament was in addition to the other documents, certificates or statements of analyses. There is not one of those documents; and, certainly this fooling around with an order passed by the House of Commons has now in my opinion passed beyond what is reasonable or even common courtesy. One begins to wonder—I say this, sir—one begins to wonder what is being hidden, and whether all the documents that parliament asked for are being presented. Now, there is one reference that the minister made; he said that as far as the file delivered today is concerned there was a point raised in the House of Commons by Mr. Coldwell, and I thought that it was pretty generally accepted, that the names of individuals should not be used and bandied around. And now, of course, I cannot see any cogency in the argument advanced by the minister that Burns and Company will suffer—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, no; I did not say that. I said some other butcher.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You did not say that?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Because Burns and Company had nothing to do with the infection nor were they in any way responsible for it. As far as the names of the farmers are concerned, I think the minister makes out a good case. I can understand that these farmers do not want to have their names used. Certainly there were several names used in the original speech made by the minister, or in the answers he gave in the House, to place the inception of the disease; certainly, if there are any more names in this record that have not been referred yet, I for one would agree to that suggestion. Having said that I ask him—and I intend to ask this afternoon at the opening of the House—that all the communications be tabled. This playing around with an order is inexcusable. I can understand the minister's explanation as to why these documents were not delivered because he himself had directed that names should not be used; but I do submit to you, sir, that one of two things stand out; either there are a lot more documents—the answers, the replies to statements, and instructions from the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa—in which case there is continuing contempt of parliament—and if there are not it shows that between January 4 and February 27 no person in Ottawa ever communicated with those officials in the field and pointed out the situation. Therefore, I say, either position is not a satisfactory position. I simply ask the minister now to ask the officials to go down into some of the bottom drawers, or if necessary to dig out some of the top secret compartments; and if there are no such communications between any officer in Ottawa—that will show that no officer in Ottawa communicated with any field officer or veterinary official at any time in writing, I will accept it, as I know the minister will be telling us what the facts are.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of this committee, and I am simply here as a member of the House; but, I suppose that I have the right to be here as minister of the department concerned. However, I think the remarks which have just been made are remarks that have to do with general procedure rather than with the investigation itself; and I would therefore like to say this, that while what the member for Lake

Centre has just said would be applicable in dealing with foot and mouth disease; it is a disease which when once established does become somewhat the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture here; but, until it becomes a contagious disease that is a reportable contagious disease there is some question as to whether there is the same responsibility of this department in Ottawa as there is when foot and mouth disease has been established. And now, the fact is, and this record indicates so far as I have been able to follow it that officials did not regard it as foot and mouth disease in the early stages; that is, between the dates that have just been referred to, from the 2nd of December 1951 to February 2nd 1952. The 26th of November, as I understand it, was the first date on which anyone, any veterinarian, was called in to have a look at the cattle that were presumed to have either the one disease or the other; the first we were asked to look into it was on the first of December, and we looked into it on the 2nd of December until early in February, so far as I can find out, there is nothing on the file to indicate that veterinarians and officials in general had concluded that the disease was foot and mouth disease. Now, as I said in the House earlier, there might be some reason for discussing—and I see that the newspaper this morning does discuss it—as to whether there should have been more speed than there was between the 2nd day of February and the 23rd day of February. I think there is some justification for saying that there might have been more communication even during that period; but then I think that it is only fair to say that I was away on a vacation and the veterinary director general himself was away on vacation from the department during part of the time, and therefore it was only natural that there would not be the communications of the same kind in a period when a person is away as there might be at another time. I have not been able to find it. Maybe through the activities of this committee they can find it. But I don't believe that anywhere between the 2nd of December and a much later date there was any reason for anyone saying to anyone else in the department—one person saying to another—this might be, or this is foot and mouth disease. As a matter of fact, if you will review that file you will find that every investigation that was made was made to determine whether it was that disease. That is what was being determined and in every case they determined it was stomatitis; and the only place where there was any indirect reference to foot and mouth disease is where someone says there was no reason for believing that it was a more serious contagious disease, or something to that effect. Now, that might have been, but it does indicate that what they were doing, what was in the minds of the men who were carrying on the investigation, was to make absolutely certain that it was not foot and mouth disease. Now, after all, any professional man of any kind has the right before he makes a decision to carry out a complete investigation; that is what the file indicates; the investigation was carried out first before the decision was made. Reference has been made to the fact that the first case proven was in the Burns Company plant at Regina in February. So long as that was the case I can quite understand that there were not any communications saying: "You had better watch out; this is foot and mouth disease." But once they came to the conclusion there was any chance of it being foot and mouth disease there are communications on the file.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: But there were no communications between February 23 and March 12, notwithstanding the fact that it was reported on the 12th, and that is why I wondered.

RIGHT HON. MR. GARDINER: Well, my reason for that is the fact, as I reported to the House, that on one occasion I went out there myself.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: That is in the documents produced today?

RIGHT HON. MR. GARDINER: It is in the documents. The fact is that I went out. The discussion which took place do not show on the documents I have

given over to the committee. At the same time, if it was necessary, I can report about it. I was there; and, these things can be produced. Also Dr. Childs can report of the occasion he was there, and he can produce the discussions that took place when he was there.

Mr. WRIGHT: What date were you there?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I went out there somewhere around the first of February and I did not get back here until—I haven't the exact date—the 26th or 27th of February, somewhere around there.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is, you were on the scene yourself from the 1st of February?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I was. Some of the time I was on the scene. I was on vacation; at least, I thought I was. And the first week in February is the week I was waiting for a celebration of the fact that I had been in politics for about 40 years.

Mr. WRIGHT: We are not particularly interested in that.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am telling you why I was there.

Mr. WRIGHT: We are interested in foot and mouth disease.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It didn't come off for certain reasons we are all sorry for. After that I went on curling for a week; and then, at the end of that week, on the 16th day of February, I went to Vancouver, and I got my first report in Vancouver, as I stated yesterday.

Mr. WRIGHT: You had made no investigation yourself?

Right. Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Why should I?

Mr. WRIGHT: Did you have the information yourself in regard to it being stomatitis? Were you not concerned about it? Or had you not heard from anyone about it?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, because I never even heard from anyone and I was right in the middle of where it was, that anybody's cattle had stomatitis. And when I did get reports later they indicated that it was merely stomatitis. Over the whole period everybody thought that it was stomatitis and that is the only reason there was not any communication. It is the same as if some kid had measles. Nobody was talking about it. I was right in among the farmers whose cattle had this disease and none of them even told me it was stomatitis.

Mr. WRIGHT: Not even your own officials.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Nobody had reason for concern about it; not even the Saskatchewan government people whose responsibility it was.

Mr. MURRAY: You have a pretty fine herd of cattle in that part of the country yourself, have you not? They reported this to your officials?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am very pleased that my friend says they reported it to our officials because a lot of people dispute that. I agreed with him that was before December 2; nevertheless, I understand, and I said in the House of Commons, that the matter was reported to the officials of the province between the 26th of November and the 1st of December.

Mr. WRIGHT: And he reported it the next day to your department?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He does not admit he did. I wrote out a report and I read it onto *Hansard*, and I read it at a meeting in Regina when Mr. Johnson was present and when Mr. Waas was present; and when they were all present at this meeting; and I said that I was going to read them what I had put on *Hansard* and I wanted them to tell me if it was correct and I asked anybody who wanted to make any correction they thought was needed, to make them. Nobody made any corrections. After the meeting, however, there

were some people who said it was not correct, that Mr. Johnson had not reported. Now, my information is that it was reported, to Mr. Johnson, a provincial man, and he did absolutely nothing. He was not asked his views in regard to it; and so far as I know did not investigate. Another version of it is simply that he told Mr. Waas to go to Mr. Hunter, and have Mr. Hunter report it. He did go to Mr. Hunter, who is not a provincial veterinary, he is a local practitioner. Whatever he did could be established, one way or another. We can have these officials here later to determine that. I do not think that we are going to get anywhere by discussing it among ourselves. But, my information is that the province did not do anything at all about it at that stage because they thought, as we thought, that it was stomatitis, and that it was not a thing to get excited about; but I hope nobody is now going to say everybody should have been excited away back there. Maybe they should have; but that is not the way practitioners operate; they are ordinary human beings. They don't go around spreading rumours that it might be some sort of serious disease that might be prevalent when some less serious disease is there. And I suggest that they can make just as many mistakes as the veterinarians. In this case, if there is anything at all about it that one can criticize, it is that they did not make a proper diagnosis, a correct diagnosis, earlier. Now, that happens right along, both in the practice of medicine and in veterinary practice; but there might be some reason for criticism there, but if there is any reason for criticism it is just as much the business of the provincial department as it is of the federal.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Will you produce those chemical examinations?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: If they are not here or on one of these documents they will be produced.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They are not.

Mr. STEWART: To save the time of the committee I suggested that certain sections of the two provincial Acts with regard to this matter of responsibility be read into the record.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart, I believe, then Mr. Argue.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Will he produce those chemical examinations this afternoon?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: If they are not on here, then they are on some of these documents and they will be produced.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, yesterday in order to save the time of the committee I suggested that we read in certain sections of two provincial acts on this matter of responsibility; they were not put into the record yesterday and it was in order to save the time of the committee that I gave the numbers of the sections and so on. I would now ask that these be printed, and for the information of the committee, in case you do not want to read the printed sections of the statutes, chapter 70 of 1949 Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, being the Contagious Diseases of Animals Act, incorporates this disease and others in the act; and under section 2 of the act, cattle, of course, are included; and "disease" means any infectious or contagious disease. Under section 3, provincial inspectors have the powers of inspectors. And under section 4—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is stomatitis a disease included under that?

Mr. STEWART: All diseases, as well as stomatitis; the definition of the one disease in here particularly brucellosis, is characterized as an undulant fever in cattle and in human beings. Under section 4 the powers and duties of the

Health of Animals Department are set forth, showing those of the field inspectors of these animals and so forth. Section 9 was read to the committee yesterday by Mr. Decore and that section is important:

Whenever it appears proper, the minister may direct an inspector or any other suitable person to examine into any alleged outbreak of brucellosis or any other disease—

That is that; and in addition they have, in the province of Saskatchewan, chapter 71 of the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan 1949, the Veterinary Services Act, whereby municipalities appoint their own veterinarians and they can go out, and they have certain powers under that act. Then you have also the Inspection of Stock Act in the province of Saskatchewan which is chapter 182, which covers the matter of shipment of livestock, and includes a limitation on the mileage that they can be shipped; and under section 4 of that act, if stock is delivered in a public place, there are certain requirements of the statute; and in connection with abattoirs and public service vehicles and railway agencies and public stockyards and so forth, they are required to keep records for a year of all livestock shipped in the province of Saskatchewan, and those records are at all time available to the provincial government under that statute. Now there are inspectors under the provincial act and they have the powers of a constable and they can also employ the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and they have the right to inspect abattoirs and stockyards under the provincial act.

There was a question raised yesterday by the member for Melfort that those powers of the province could not be exercised in view of the dominion legislation, but he was entirely incorrect and until those statutes are attacked in Saskatchewan and set aside, then statutes apply; so the provincial government in Saskatchewan had full powers to inspect and go into the question of all these diseases, as well as the federal authorities. I presume the committee will want to deal with this phase of the question when they finally bring in their report.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Before I sat down, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should have explained that as soon as it was established that it was foot and mouth disease, or as soon as it became possible that it might be foot and mouth disease, we have had every possible cooperation with the officials, both federal and provincial in the province.

This matter was one which was raised by Mr. Diefenbaker, with regard to the Burns plant, and it was not my intention that anything be kept off this file, or that anyone should not mention the name of the Burns plant; that has been mentioned all over the place. But if somebody in the province of Ontario, for example, got beef shipped to him, let us say, last January or last December from the Burns plant in Regina down here, I do not think it is fair to that man down here to have it bruited all over the country that he had that meat in his butcher shop, because other people might be driven away from his butcher shop because of that; or even with respect to the men who distributed meat down here, who got shipments from Burns in Ontario, I do not think anything is going to be gained by spreading that around. But for the benefit of members, it would be all right to look at this file and see where it went; but I think it would be better not to talk too much about it here.

Mr. STEWART: I will leave these sections then with the secretary so that they can be put into the record and you can read them.

"Shipment of Stock

3. (1) No stock shall be placed in a railway car or in a public service vehicle until the shipper has given to the railway agent or to the driver of the vehicle a signed statement in form A, made in triplicate, on which the stock has been properly listed and described.

(2) Forms shall be provided by the department to railway agents and owners of public service vehicles and to other persons requesting the same.

(3) Where stock is shipped by rail one copy of the statement shall be attached by the agent to the way-bill, one copy shall be kept on file by the agent, and the third copy shall be forwarded by him to the commissioner not later than the day following the shipment.

(4) Where stock is placed in a railway car at a station where there is no railway agent, the three copies of the statement shall be handed to the train conductor who shall deliver the same to the nearest billing agent. One copy of the statement shall be attached to the way-bill by the billing agent, one copy shall be kept on file by the billing agent, and the third copy shall be forwarded by him to the commissioner not later than the first day of the following week.

(5) Where stock is shipped by public service vehicle one copy of the statement shall be retained by the driver of the vehicle and delivered by him to the consignee, one copy shall be kept on file by the owner of the vehicle, and the third copy shall be forwarded by the owner to the commissioner not later than the day following the shipment. 1939, c. 70, s. 3.

4. If stock is delivered to a public stockyard or abattoir and the statement in form A is not received therewith, the person in charge of the stockyard or abattoir shall prepare in duplicate statement setting forth:

- (a) the non-receipt of the statement;
 - (b) the class or kind of stock delivered;
 - (c) the name and address of the shipper of the stock;
 - (d) the number of head of each class or kind of stock delivered;
 - (e) a description of the stock, including ages and brands;
- and shall, not later than the day following delivery of the stock, forward one copy of the statement to the commissioner. The other copy shall be kept on file at the stockyard or abattoir. 1939, c. 70, s. 4.

5. Forms and statements received pursuant to this Act by railway agents, owners of public service vehicles or persons in charge of public stockyards or abattoirs shall be retained by them for a period of not less than one year and shall be open to inspection during business hours by the commissioner, an inspector, a member of the police force of a city or by any person claiming an interest in stock listed in a statement. 1939, c. 70, s. 5.

6. (1) No person shall drive on foot any stock from any point in the province to another point in the province distant more than twenty miles, or from any point in the province to any point outside the province, unless under the authority of and in accordance with a permit (form B) obtained from the commissioner or an inspector.

(2) Where a permit is issued by an inspector, he shall forthwith forward a copy thereof to the commissioner. 1939, c. 70, s. 6.

Stock Inspection

7. Every inspector shall for the purposes of this Act have the powers of a constable. 1939, c. 70, s. 7.

8. Every member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police shall ex officio be an inspector under this Act. 1939, c. 70, s. 8.

10. (1) The minister may appoint an inspector at any public stockyard or abattoir.

(2) Where an inspector finds that an animal is not correctly described in a statement in form A delivered at a public stockyard or abattoir or has been unlawfully shipped, he shall detain the animal, communicate with the owner thereof, if known, and request instructions as to the disposition of the animal; and if the owner is unknown or the inspector cannot within three days ascertain who is the owner, he shall offer the animal for sale by auction or otherwise at a reserve price equal to its current market value according to class and age at the point of shipment or places where the animal is detained.

(3) No inspector shall purchase in person or by his agent stock offered for sale by him, nor shall he acquire any interest of any kind in an animal detained by him. 1939, c. 70, s. 10."

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Argue.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, we did get a statement from the Minister of Agriculture just now that the Saskatchewan government and its officials have co-operated in every possible way and I received a suggestion that all the authorities of the federal government were responsible for reportable diseases—and because the Hull laboratory was the one laboratory in Canada which was properly equipped to test this disease, there should be a suggestion now or even an inference that the Saskatchewan officials in any way have fallen down. The minister has said that we did not know that this was foot and mouth disease, and that no one suggested that it was, and there was no evidence that it was. Therefore it was too bad, and we could not help it. But we were told yesterday afternoon by the veterinary general that the department is on its toes, and that it is checking on foot and mouth disease in every country in the world and that it is watching over the health of animals coming into Canada and looking after these things in every way. Well, let us see if there is some evidence already produced which would suggest, even to a layman, that there might have been some reasonable suspicion before February 12 that the disease, stomatitis, so-called, was in fact foot and mouth disease.

The report by Dr. James, the inspector, on January 28, 1951, was tabled yesterday and it reported a condition in the Burns plant, of some 30 diseased animals on December 28, long before any steps were taken to see whether or not this might be foot and mouth disease. And what is the report? The report is this, in part, and I will read the pertinent parts: in 30 of these cattle there were exhibited symptoms of stomatitis, and it defines stomatitis as this: slobbering considerable amounts of saliva from the mouths; difficulty in drinking, and inability to feed properly; temperatures slightly elevated, and stiffness in gait when walking. Very well. Then I took a definition of the symptoms of foot and mouth disease from the Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 9, on page 468 where it says that some of the symptoms of foot and mouth disease are a rise of temperature which precedes the vesicular eruption, which is accompanied by salivation and a peculiar "smacking" of the lips; and that a rise in temperature accompanies that foot and mouth disease. The same condition was reported in the 30 head of sick cattle in the Burns plant. The animal cannot feed so well as usual and there is more or less lameness, in the report on the cattle in the Burns plant; and they reported stiffness in gait when walking. Lameness is a constant symptom, and the feet become very much diseased, and the animal is so crippled that it has to be destroyed. There are symptoms of foot and mouth disease given in the report on December 28 which are similar to the symptoms of foot and mouth as described in the Encyclopedia Britannica in these respects: slobbering at the mouth; considerable rise in temperature; difficulty in drinking, and stiffness in gait.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for interfering, but on a point of order, I think we are getting back into what was said once or twice a few days

ago. Yesterday I think we had agreed to hear Dr. Childs. At 6:00 o'clock he was interrupted in his statement; and he was giving us the chronological account of the events all through this disease. I think that is one of the things that most of us—at least myself—are very anxious to get, therefore I think this discussion would be better sometime after we have had the statement from Dr. Childs. I think we should proceed in an orderly fashion in the way we were proceeding yesterday, and carry on from where we left off.

The CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Argue finish his statement.

Mr. ARGUE: I shall conclude in one minute. But on a point of order, I was making these remarks because the minister stated to the committee this morning that there was no evidence whatever that might suggest to anybody in December or in January that the disease could be foot and mouth disease. Well, all I am saying is that the report of December 28 should have suggested in the strongest possible way to anyone, even to a layman who had no knowledge whatever of this disease, that it was, or that it might in fact be foot and mouth disease; and that is why those tests should have been made earlier. I know the veterinary general yesterday said that their officials had been instructed not to talk loosely about foot and mouth disease. Well, his telegram of February 15 countermanded instructions to take the tests to see if it was foot and mouth disease, and I should think that anyone who knows anything about what is going on—

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, this is the very thing that Dr. Childs was going to deal with yesterday and was getting at; so why not reserve the questioning until you have heard Dr. Childs?

Mr. ARGUE: Well, the minister introduced this subject.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I object to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARGUE: He attempted to drag in the Saskatchewan government, and I endeavoured to refute his statement.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: My friend said a lot more than that when he was on his feet. I was answering what the hon. member for Lake Center said when I rose. I was not discussing what you are discussing. I think I had the right to answer. I agree that this point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we will now call on Dr. Childs.

Mr. QUELCH: Might I make a comment, Mr. Chairman? In the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture the minister said that it would not be wise to give any publicity to the names of the butchers who received meat from the Burns plant. We now know that there was disease, and that some of that meat was contaminated with foot and mouth disease, and that that meat was shipped across the dominion to Vancouver, Calgary and Montreal. Now we hear that at Ormstown there is foot and mouth as a result of bones being thrown out. I think the widest possible publicity should be given at all points to which that meat was shipped, warning farmers that they should not throw out any raw meat or bones because there is disease and it might spread the disease. We know that foot and mouth disease is in Saskatchewan and we do not want it to spread to the provinces; and meat which may have been contaminated has been shipped to other provinces; so the least we can do is to warn the provinces and explain to them that in the event of canning that meat, if they decide to cut out the bones first, they should be sure to bury or burn those bones.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us call on Dr. Childs now.

Mr. CHARLTON: I would like to support what the hon. member has just said. I mentioned before in the House of Commons that that should be done and that we should give all the publicity possible in order to warn people against the use of that frozen meat, to make sure that the bones are cooked.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Childs.

Mr. STEWART: I think the member for Lake Center will possibly agree with me on this, that so far we have not heard any evidence as to the background and qualifications of our witness, Dr. Childs, such as how long he has been in the department and what his qualifications are and what weight should be given to his evidence as the result of his standing. Therefore, I think he should start off today by giving us a brief resume of his time in the department and his qualifications, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us now call on Dr. Childs.

Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director-General recalled:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, hon. minister, and hon. gentlemen:

Mr. ROSS: Would you mind speaking up, Dr. Childs, we have difficulty in hearing you.

The WITNESS: Yes sir. I shall raise my voice. As to qualifications, I would mention the public and the high schools, and collegiates at Lethbridge and Calgary; graduation from the Ontario Veterinary College in 1915; approximately 4 years in the Royal Army Veterinary Corps in Britain; and in the line of experience, service in France, in Mesopotamia, as it was at that time, or Iraq today; Persia, and India.

I was for some months in charge of a diagnostic laboratory at Lahore, India; I returned from service and took a post-graduate course at the Ontario Veterinary College, where I specialized mostly in bacteriology and pathology. Then I was in practice for approximately 5 years or thereabouts out west, in Alberta. I joined the department at Edmonton on the 25th of September, 1925, and I have held various positions in the service since then, almost all the various positions outside, both in meat inspection and in the field. And I came to Ottawa around September 15, 1946, as assistant to the then Veterinary Director-General and I was promoted to the position which I now hold within the next few months. I might say that approximately 6 weeks after my arrival, the Veterinary Director-General decided to retire and I was acting in charge for some few months. Since then I have been here at Ottawa carrying on in that position.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. You also had some connection with the United States?—A. Yes, that is true. I have been rather active with our friends across the line, that is, with the American Veterinary and Medical Association; but more so with the United States Livestock Organization. This organization represents all states and territories of the United States; its membership consists of the state veterinaries and their assistants, prominent livestock men of the United States, and representatives of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States; and we are represented in that organization. We have official membership of the same standing as the Bureau of Animal Industry in the United States. I have been quite active with that organization.

Q. When would that be?—A. Shortly after I came down here. And as I said, I have been active in getting livestock entry into the United States, which was something which hinged greatly on the health status of Canadian livestock which was not nearly as good then as it is now, outside of this foot and mouth disease. I was quite active, and I was closely associated with the membership there; and some three years ago I was elected third vice president; and the following year, second vice president; and last year, first vice president; and I am being referred to now as president elect of the organization. I might say, gentlemen, that I consider this to be one of the greatest honours I have ever

had because I am the first Canadian who has ever been given an official position in that organization. I think those are all the qualifications I have to describe right now.

The CHAIRMAN: You may go right on.

The WITNESS: Last night I broke off when we were up at Regina. I would like to give you the details of the activities around there. But I shall need to go back a little on that to give you the picture so you will be in a position to understand sequence of events.

I commenced my statutory leave. I was some two years behind with my statutory leave and I hoped to get some of it used up before the end of the past fiscal year. At that time we could not see anything very serious on the horizon, so I decided to take some of this statutory leave. Therefore, I commenced my leave on Monday the 11th of February. I think I took four days and then came into the office to pick up some mail, when I found out that our staff out in Regina was becoming concerned about this condition of vesicular stomatitis. I found out also that there had been a wire or a message from Dr. Carlson who was assistant district veterinarian out there, showing concern about conditions, and I believe he had asked that somebody be sent out from the laboratory—that is the Animal Disease Research Institute—to make inoculations and field tests.

We were short-handed and it was suggested and agreed upon by Dr. Hall, who is my assistant, that they would collect the material out there and send it back. Having knowledge of that, I was very much concerned in this way: it is very, very dangerous exposing foot and mouth disease virus to hazards of transportation and it was beginning to look serious at that time; and it would be a very serious thing if by any chance infection would be spread to other parts of the country, particularly to eastern Canada; it would be a very, very serious thing. Therefore it was in my mind to go out there myself or get somebody else, if I found that I could not get out, to collect those samples and bring them down in person, to make sure that they arrived with no breakage or loss or anything like that. However, I decided and I sent a wire asking that they hold up the collection of samples or the sending of samples and to make field tests out there; and I decided to go out myself and look into the thing, which I did.

I left Ottawa after consultation with my superior officers, and I explained that I thought there might be something out there more serious than was thought at that particular time, so I went out by plane.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. On February 15, when you sent that wire, were you on duty or on leave?—A. I was on leave, I guess, on the 15th. No, I think I was on duty; I took just about 4 days leave. I went out by plane, leaving Ottawa on the evening of the 16th and I arrived early Sunday morning on the 17th at Regina. I looked around and consulted with our staff there and the result was that I sent a wire which was filed that same night on the 17th, about half past eleven. I think you will find that wire. The wire really got away from Regina on the early morning of the 18th. The wire has been read already. It was to the effect that there was ample evidence present to suggest or to justify a quarantine; so I made up my mind then that we had foot and mouth disease, but we did not say it. We were well aware of what would occur as soon as that was said.

But in the meantime, we did not sit around and talk about what we were going to do. You will understand. On the morning of the 18th we started to work, and we could see, after looking around and examining things generally, that we were in for it. I could see that. We started to organize things to handle this in order to prevent its spread. We set up an organization to deal with it.

I will go over a few of those things here because some of you gentlemen present apparently consider that some of these things were not done. That is not the case, even though you may have been told differently before. The first thing to do was to improve our communications, inter-office communications; we needed more furniture, more telephones and things of that kind. One of the first things that we did was to get word out to our officers in charge at Winnipeg not to delay. There is the bottleneck where livestock goes through from the west. You know, I believe, that the flow is to the east from the prairies, and to the south, Winnipeg being the main bottleneck. We instituted a modified quarantine there; that is, nothing was to go out of those yards, except for immediate slaughter; and everything to be examined most closely. That was done. At the same time, about as quick as I could get on to it, we placed a modified quarantine on the stockyards at Saskatoon and Prince Albert. As I say, the modified quarantine permitted only a one-way traffic; livestock could come into the yards, but it could not go out, because it came under our modified quarantine as it came in. The next day, of course, we included Moose Jaw in this, although there is nothing up that way at all. Those things were done. There was also the matter of arranging for getting more staff in. We started to get them in as quickly as we could, as quickly as we could arrange transport, to get around to make farm inspections. There was the matter of getting adequate equipment for disinfecting purposes, staff, supplies—they had to have rubber clothing especially; and that clothing included boots, coats and hats. There was a host of things. We also at that time started the machinery in motion to trace and inspect livestock, not only from the area which was quarantined then or which is now quarantined, but all over the prairie provinces where they had moved—either to the other provinces or to the States. This was done. Also meats. We know meats went to every part of the country, clear to Ontario—to various cities. We know that. Now, lots of that got to the cities and towns. We don't fear damage from this very much, for these reasons, we have a very fine system which kept hog cholera out of this country for a decade—except for a small outbreak a few years ago. For instance in connection with garbage collection, wherever garbage is collected, wherever garbage is fed to hogs—unless it is produced on their farms—any collected garbage must be cooked before it is fed to swine. All these garbage collectors are licensed. Their premises are inspected periodically; once a month—or much more than that since this outbreak. Therefore, we have no undue apprehension of anything regarding meats that go to cities and towns. As for the others, butchers—retail outlets in rural districts—we have had an example of that, we could not find them all, that is obvious; but they have been warned about this. Every care was taken to have such material destroyed, and we even had them burn the bones so that it would be completely destroyed. Now, those are the things we did, gentlemen. I put in three days at Regina getting the groundwork started to deal with this thing. At the same time, before I went west, in consultation with my superiors, it was decided that if I thought necessary, I should inform our friends at Washington that we had a serious disease out there, it might be serious ultimately; and it had been arranged years ago with the United States officials; we have an understanding, that if any serious disease breaks out in either country the other country will be immediately informed; or, if it is suspected, they will be kept informed. We have very close liaison there. So, of course, I telephoned Dr. Simms, who is the chief of the bureau in Washington, the Bureau of Animal Industry, from Regina, as soon as I had satisfied myself that we were dealing with something serious—foot and mouth disease—but I did not use the word foot and mouth disease.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What date was that?—A. February 18th, 1952.

Q. That was in February?—A. Yes. February 18th, 1952. The result was, of course, that Dr. Simms moved very quickly. He was good enough to send to Regina an expert on the foot and mouth disease, Dr. M. S. Shahan. He was instructed to go to Regina to make observations and to assist us officially in making and verifying diagnoses. Unfortunately, although it does not matter very much, Dr. Shahan was delayed on account of weather conditions and he did not arrive until I had left. I might say though that on the 18th we purchased test animals and started tests. We got no results during my time there. I had to leave before all the tests had been completed. One of the first things Dr. Shahan did was to ask for some test animals and make some tests, and that was done. Now, I think that gives you the picture of what went on during that period. I do not think there is anything more to say there, except that I took Dr. Wells along with me just so I could have somebody in case this turned out to be serious; I took him along and I left him there in charge of operations. I might say generally that the outbreak of foot and mouth disease occurred in Mexico in November of 1946, and as soon as we could get around to it, which was not until a year later, we sent down two of our men, two of our veterinarians, as observers, to have a look at the situation and to see how they handled this disease; to see the appearance of it. Both of them got first hand information about it. You will understand, gentlemen, that heretofore has been practically nobody from the veterinary profession in North America who had ever seen foot and mouth disease. They are very few. We have perhaps two or three in the service and I am one of those myself. I probably saw more than any of the others.

By Mr. Bennett:

Q. You might give us the names of those veterinaries; could you do that?—A. You mean who were sent down to study this disease?

Q. Yes, could you give us their names?—A. Yes. Dr. K. F. Wells and Dr. E. E. Carlson. These gentlemen went to Mexico and they were taken under the wing of the Bureau of Animal industry there and shown around over the country, shown exactly how it was handled there, shown the disease and all that. Dr. Wells reported from Regina. When I went to Regina I took Dr. Wells along because he had had that experience. Dr. Carlson was already on the job. Dr. Carlson has seen foot and mouth disease in Mexico; and Dr. Carlson, of course, is stationed at Regina. As a matter of fact, he is the assistant district veterinarian there.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. For how long?—A. He has been the assistant district veterinary there now for going on two years. I would say he has always been—well, for the last 15 years or more—stationed in Saskatchewan. A year or two ago the United States Bureau of Animal Industry was concerned over not having men who were competent to make diagnoses of vesicular diseases generally; so much so that they set up a school to train men. I think that school commenced something over a year ago. And they, quite naturally of course, took on a limited number for training. They restricted it to a dozen men. Of course, many others wanted to go, but they could not take more. The Bureau of Animal Industry was good enough to curtail their number of men, to leave out two, and took two of ours for training. The idea of training these men, of course, was to place them in strategic positions throughout the country, which has been done. They were good enough to give us places for two men in that school down in the

United States, and on the 16th of February two of our men left for Washington. That was the same day as I left Ottawa for Regina, which was the 16th of February. It is a six weeks course, it is a very intensive course of training in the diagnosis of vesicular diseases. On their return we immediately moved one of these men up to Regina so that they would have the benefit of the fresh training he had received. We kept another one in reserve here in Ottawa in case there might be another outbreak in some other part of the country so that we would be able quickly to send someone who knew something about it. There is another school in operation at the present time in the U.S.A. and the U.S. bureau have been good enough to keep room for us for two more of our men who are down there now taking this intensive course. Until they started this there was practically nobody in the United States, except for a few of us like myself, in the case of our department, very few of us had ever seen foot and mouth disease; and the only ones the United States had were those who had handled the last outbreak they had had down there, which was in 1929, and as I recall that was in California. They have all disappeared, except one or two. There are very few, if any, active now, except the assistant chief, I believe. They are very much concerned about this particular school, this training.

By Mr. Bennett:

Q. Would you explain to us laymen the difference between the two diseases we are discussing; the various tests and the method of determining them? We do not know too much about them.

Mr. CHARLTON: I wonder if before that is done, he could give us the names of the four men he mentioned.

The WITNESS: You mean the names of the men who took the training?

Mr. CHARLTON: Yes.

The WITNESS: First of all, Dr. L. Moore, and Dr. H. E. Knapp; and presently there are Dr. Roland Nadeau and Dr. E. A. Rankin. Now, your question, sir?

By Mr. Bennett:

Q. I would like you to explain the difference between these two diseases? We have heard a lot about the various tests that were employed to diagnose foot and mouth disease as separate from the other?—A. Yes, there are various tests.

Q. I would like you to describe some of the tests.—A. You would like me to describe them, I will do the best I can. We have a gentleman present here in this committee better qualified than I am to explain it to you.

The CHAIRMAN: Would it not be better to wait until he is called?

Mr. BENNETT: That is quite all right.

The WITNESS: However, if you wish, I will make a start on it.

The CHAIRMAN: No, we will leave it to the other official to do that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: If I may—is Dr. Childs through with his statement?

The CHAIRMAN: Have you finished your statement, Dr. Childs?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. First I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Stewart has performed a worthwhile service in having Dr. Childs give us his qualifications. Now, Dr. Childs, I have looked over this file; that is the one in answer to the motion passed by parliament; and am I not correct when I suggest to you this, that between the 4th day of January and the 15th day of February you made no written

communication with any official in the field or anywhere else within your department with regard to foot and mouth disease or stomatitis?—A. I don't think I ever communicated.

Q. No; and you, of course, were greatly concerned right from the beginning of this outbreak, were you not?—A. I was most concerned when I heard it first. I thought, well, maybe there is something serious.

Q. You said you were most concerned?

The CHAIRMAN: He answered your question.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. I did not hear his answer.—A. I was quite concerned at first when I heard it was a vesicular disease, but knowing that there were men there who had seen enough of these diseases—

Q. Pardon me?—A. Knowing that we had men on the job who had seen both vesicular diseases and foot and mouth disease I was not very apprehensive.

Q. You mean?—A. They called it vesicular stomatitis.

Q. And, as you told us a moment ago, it is difficult to diagnose this foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes, it is difficult.

Q. And, indeed, that school was started down in the United States just for the purpose of educating veterinarians in the technique of these diseases?—A. Yes.

Q. And the reason for these schools would naturally be the difficulty excepting for experienced men by visual examination, to determine whether the disease is foot and mouth disease or stomatitis?—A. Well, a visual examination, and certain other tests that I am not up on.

Q. No. I understand, because of some of the facts brought out here that you had not concluded these tests, but you did know that the symptoms are very much alike?—A. They will resemble each other very closely where you have a very mild case of foot and mouth disease such as we have out here. That is a milder type, type A.

Q. And for that reason visual examination would be next to impossible?—A. It would be difficult for a person who had not close experience in both diseases in their clinical aspects.

Q. You were fully on guard against the possibility of foot and mouth disease coming to Canada, were you not?—A. We want to be, sir.

Q. And you were throughout the years?—A. Yes.

Q. As a matter of fact, you gave an interview to someone—I think it was some time in January, someone from the *Family Herald and Weekly Star*—regarding the danger of foot and mouth disease spreading to Canada from other parts of the world?—A. Perhaps I did, but I don't recall it.

Q. I read to you from the issue of the 28th of February, on page 11, to Miss Mary Hamilton.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the year?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: 1952.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. I just read this and ask you whether or not you agree with it:

"A foot and mouth disease outbreak makes necessary greater precautions in Canada. Ministry of Agriculture officials told him of the alertness of Dr. Childs at Ottawa to the dangers of the present epidemic"

Is that correct, or is it not, that you were very alert right from the beginning to the dangers of this epidemic in Saskatchewan?—A. Oh yes, there is no doubt about that.

Q. And, being alert, did you throughout—and I am not going to ask you for particulars—but did you get good co-operation from all the officials in your department?—A. Yes, as far as I know, sir.

Q. And also from officials in any other sector or sections of the department?—A. Oh yes, yes.

Q. And then, after the 23rd of December, certain things took place, certain diseases were found? In December—on November 1, vesicular disease, some disease, a disease was found on one farm?—A. No, it was not found on one farm; that is, not at that time.

Q. And was that in December, on December 2?—A. It was not—I would have to verify the date—it would not be until the 24th of February.

Q. Oh, no; I mean the first disease, not foot and mouth disease.—A. The disease? I thought you meant A-type.

Q. I am just asking you a general question about disease, and it was in the record that these specimens were of a contagious disease; and the record that was sent to you from time to time, was it not?—A. Yes.

Q. And you immediately, being alert as to what was taking place, took steps to find out whether or not this was foot and mouth disease?—A. Surely.

Q. And you would communicate with your deputy minister to bring to his attention the situation that had arisen that has a dangerous potential?—A. No, I do not think I did at that time because we did not consider it was serious until I got the reports in.

Q. Then, a little later on, two or three farms were attacked with a similar disease, in the month of December?—A. Yes.

Q. And then, finally, in the latter part of December, the Burns' plant was seriously attacked?—A. It did not appear very serious at the time.

Q. I did not hear you.—A. It did not appear very serious at that time.

Q. It did not appear very serious at that time?—A. No.

Q. But you made the statement that it was serious enough to apply quarantine?—A. Well, I don't recall saying that.

Q. You applied a quarantine, did you not?—A. I don't recall saying it was a serious thing.

Q. I thought you used that expression, I thought that you said that in February it was serious enough to apply a quarantine?—A. That is right.

Mr. MAJOR: Mr. Chairman, I don't think Mr. Diefenbaker has any right to ask that type of questions of the witness. He is putting in them the answers he wants to get from the witness. I do not think that is the fair way of doing it.

Mr. WRIGHT: If the witness had brought in a written statement which could have been passed around to members it would have been easy to follow.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am only trying to get information.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. You asked for a report on the Burns' plant, did you not?—A. Yes.

Q. And, Dr. Childs, you asked Dr. Christie to provide you with the James' report?—A. Yes.

Q. Pardon me?—A. Yes.

Q. That was on the 28th of December when you had a wire from Dr. Christie. He says:

"One hundred and thirty seven steers and seventy heifers of which thirty head are exhibiting symptoms of infectious vesicular stomatitis in Burns and Co. Feed Lots Establishment Twenty Three E stop premises quarantined and report by Dr. N. V. James being mailed to you stop healthy animals allowed to be slaughtered.

(Signed) N. D. Christie."

And, following this outbreak in the Burns' plant, naturally you then became more alert than you had been before to the danger of this disease spreading, whatever it was?—A. Yes.

Q. And you received no wire from Dr. James for several days, did you?—A. No.

Q. And then you got a report from Dr. James which you produced yesterday?—A. I don't believe I have that with me. It is in our file and the date would be on it, stamped on it.

Q. On the statement we got there is no date stamp.

Mr. JUTRAS: Yes, there is.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q The date of the report is December 25, and I am asking you the date that you received it. Have you any record of that?—A. There will be a record, of course.

Q. Well, if you will get that information and give it to us; "awaiting Dr. James' report vesicular stomatitis Burns' feed lot Regina reported wire of December 28 stop long delay not understood stop please expedite repeat please expedite". You sent that wire?—A. Yes.

Q. You were very disturbed at that time because you had asked Dr. James to make an early report?—A. Yes, it struck me that as the report did not appear in due time, to ask for a report.

Q. And that was the reason for your repeating at the end there, "please expedite"; and that indicates that you were very serious about this matter and wanted action?—A. Yes, I wanted the report.

Q. And you do not know when you got the report?—A. No, I could not say right now.

Q. You have already told the committee that you did not know when you got the reports on the various tests that were made; but, as a general rule, you were aware of the fact that in order to determine finally whether it was foot and mouth disease you had to have the results of these reports, and you would have to make certain decisions, did you not?—A. Yes.

Q. Indicating results?—A. Yes.

Q. And you realized that serum had to be got from England?—A. Yes.

Q. Why didn't you get that serum from England—and when I say "you" I mean your department. I am not speaking of you personally.—A. The serum was procured just as soon as it was thought that there was need for it.

Q. So then the serum was procured when?—A. I believe you should direct that question to Dr. Mitchell.

Q. Well, I thought you as head of the department would be able to say approximately when the serum was sent?—A. It would be between February 16 and 20, I would think; but Dr. Mitchell could answer that.

Q. On what date was it that you finally determined in your mind that this might be foot and mouth disease?—A. February 17th.

Q. February 17th?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the reason for that conclusion?—A. Well, from looking over the situation right in Regina.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. Having looked in Regina and having had a consultation with my men, and from a study of the lesions and the way the disease had spread in the last 10 days or so.

Q. I could not hear you.—A. A consultation with my staff in Regina and a study of the lesions, and the way this thing was increasing in malignancy, plus spread.

Q. Who was the doctor who first suggested that it was foot and mouth disease even before the examination or tests were taken?—A. I do not recall anybody suggesting it was foot and mouth disease.

Q. Is it correct to say that from the first day, the 27th of November until you were in Regina on the 17th of February no member of your staff or anyone else suggested that this might be foot and mouth disease?—A. No, I do not recall anybody suggesting it.

Q. All right; you did have three inoculations made, did you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the purpose of the inoculations?—A. Do you mean the first inoculation?

Q. Yes; the inoculations that were made in December?—A. The purpose of those was to determine whether or not we had foot and mouth disease.

Q. I see; and there were three inoculations taken altogether, three, during the entire period from the 27th of November until the 17th of February; is that not so?—A. Yes, I believe that is correct.

Q. There was one taken on December 2?—A. Yes.

Q. There was not another one taken until February 7; is that not correct?—A. I am not so certain of that.

Q. That information, as I remember it, was given by the Hon. Mr. Gardiner originally, at pages 79 to 92 of *Hansard*. Now then, I put it to you, that the first inoculation was taken on December 2, and the next inoculation on February 17.—A. I think I have it here, sir.

Q. Yes, I know.—A. There were two horses inoculated on December 3.

Q. You say there were 2 horses inoculated on December 3?—A. At the Waas premises.

Q. Yes; and what was the next inoculation?—A. The next one was on a horse on the premises of L. Wood.

Q. On what date?—A. On December 12.

Q. Yes, and the next?—A. Another horse was inoculated on the premises of K. Hahn, on February 12, also.

Q. On what date?—A. On February 12, also; 2 horses on the 3rd at the Waas premises on December 3.

Q. On December 3?—A. On the Waas premises; and one on the Wood premises on December 12.

Q. Right.—A. And one horse inoculated on February 12 on the premises of K. Hahn, at Regina; Dr. James carried out those inoculations.

Q. And there were no others during that period?—A. That is right.

Q. I am just asking for information; the disease was spreading pretty generally in that period of time and there were about 19 or 20 cases, were there not, in the month of January; some 19 or 20 cases?—A. The greatest spread was in January and the first part of February.

Q. But during the month of January were there not about 19 cases?—A. I do not think there were that many in January.

Q. How many do your figures show there were in January?—A. I have not counted them up. I think there were eleven.

Q. Eleven; well, you have got the record there.

Mr. JUTRAS: What part of January?

The WITNESS: To the end of January.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: From the 23rd on.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Is that right, that there were eleven?—A. Yes, I believe that to be right.

Q. And with the spread of the disease into 11 places in January, in the face of that, no member of your department in the field or in Ottawa suggested that there should be further inoculations in order to determine the incidence or the nature of the disease; is that what you say?—A. I do not recall there being any suggestion along that line.

Q. And then came the month of February and during the first two weeks in February, quite a further group of cases arose?—A. That is correct.

Q. How many were there during the first two weeks?—A. There would be a dozen or so.

Q. A dozen?—A. Around there.

Q. And how many of those cases had arisen between the 1st of February and the date you left on vacation?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Just five.

The WITNESS: I believe there would be about 4 or 5.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. And as I look over the record, am I not telling you what is a fact, that during that period, during January, all of those cases were arising, 11 cases, and in February, from the 1st to the 13th, there is not one letter from any official in Ottawa to the officers in the field regarding the seriousness of the situation?—A. No, there probably is not.

Q. No. Well, you have gone over the records, have you not?—A. Yes, I have gone over them.

Q. Is it not correct that from day to day you would discuss this matter here in Ottawa, I mean the seriousness of those reports as they came in from day to day?—A. Yes, we discussed them.

Q. Well, just for the sake of information, with a continually expanding disease as it was, with 11 cases in January, and almost the same number in February, up to the 13th, how did you keep these officials on the job, how did you alert them? How did you make them realize the seriousness of what was taking place?—A. We required a quarantine on all the premises affected.

Q. I see; but there were no instructions given whatsoever to the officials either to secure serum or to inoculate during that period from the 4th day of January until the 13th day of February, no written instructions to that effect?—A. If it is not on the record, that would be so.

Q. Now, as soon as you went on your vacation, Dr. Mitchell was left in charge?—A. No. Dr. Hall.

Q. And Dr. Hall had been in Ottawa during January up until the 13th of February?—A. Yes, he was in Ottawa, I believe.

Q. And he is your assistant?—A. That is right.

Q. And during January up to the 13th of February, did Dr. Hall at any time suggest to you the possibility of foot and mouth disease?—A. I recall that we talked it over and came to the conclusion that there was no cause for alarm.

Q. You came to the conclusion that there was no cause for alarm; and how many days was that; the day you went on vacation was the 11th. You went on vacation on the 11th?—A. Yes, on Monday, the 11th.

Q. And how long before the 11th did you and Dr. Hall determine there was no cause for alarm?—A. Oh, it would possibly be a week or so before.

Q. And the American doctor, Shahan, arrived on the 17th of February?—A. No, I did not say that.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. I did not say that.

Q. What date was that?—A. He arrived, I think, about the 23rd of February.

Q. Were there no American representatives there prior to the 23rd of February?—A. No.

Q. You say there were not?—A. You said "American representatives".

Q. Yes.—A. No.

Q. I beg your pardon.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): Was he not delayed by a storm?

The WITNESS: He surely was.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): That is what the record says.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Now, almost as soon as you left, you know now that Dr. Hall, in collaboration with Dr. Mitchell, issued instructions for the collection and forwarding to the laboratory at Hull of materials from the animals suffering from this disease; that was done; and from the record, on what date was it, when they gave those instructions, according to the records in your department?

—A. I think that is the 13th.

Q. You say the 13th?—A. Yes.

Q. And when did you first hear about it?—A. I think it was the 15th.

Q. On the 15th?—A. Yes.

Q. And you came back rather unexpectedly on the 15th, did you not?—

A. As a matter of fact, I came back to pick up some mail.

Q. And then you found out that during your absence Dr. Hall, who had taken your place, was acting in your place?—A. Yes.

Q. And Dr. Mitchell had issued instructions for the collection of samples; and did you have any conversation with either of them?—A. I did, with Dr. Hall.

Q. And did you criticize him for the stand taken?—A. Not seriously, no.

Q. Not seriously? Well, did you do it in any other way?—A. Any more than to indicate that I was very dubious about moving anything that might be serious, as I mentioned before when giving you the general picture, for fear of having it spread by either losing it or breakage on the way down.

Q. So what you told Dr. Hall was that you were afraid that the action he had taken might increase the fear that this was foot and mouth disease?—A. No, not increase the fear.

Q. Then what was it?—A. If it was foot and mouth disease, I considered there was a danger in bringing material down here.

Q. You considered there was a danger?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, you have already told Mr. Bennett that you did not know very much about the various tests, and that it was not in your line?—A. I know enough about them for that, sir.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. I know enough about them for that, oh yes.

Q. And then you countermanded his instructions?—A. Yes, I sent a wire.

Q. Did you tell him beforehand that you had put a stop to the whole thing?—A. No, because I "done" this from home at night.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It is marked "phone".

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. And then you went out immediately?—A. As soon as I could get a plane.

Q. It was the 15th when you sent the wire?—A. Yes.

Q. And when did you go out?—A. On the evening of the 16th.

Q. That was quite a delay, was it not, in the matter of securing a connection?—A. No. There was no delay, because samples had already been collected and sent along.

Q. But you did not know that when you sent the wire?—A. No.

Q. When did you then find out that your order could not take effect because specimens had already been sent?—A. I spoke to them at Regina over the telephone.

Q. When?—A. On the 16th.

Q. Whom did you speak to?—A. Dr. Carlson.

Q. At what time?—A. That would be in the evening, perhaps 7:00 o'clock; I could not say the exact time.

Q. You say it was in the evening; that is all right.—A. Maybe later.

Q. Then you went out there; and before you left for the west, did you suspect it was foot and mouth disease?—A. I already suspected a more serious condition.

Q. But did you suspect it was foot and mouth disease?—A. I suspected it might be, yes.

Q. And that was the first that you ever suspected that it was?—A. I think likely I could say yes, it was.

Q. What took place on the 16th which caused you to change your mental diagnosis that you had made up to that time? What took place on that date?—A. A message had arrived previously from people out there, indicating particular concern about this.

Q. All right. Now, whose message was that?—A. I believe it was from Dr. Carlson.

Q. Was it not in writing?—A. I think it was a telephone call.

Q. Have you a memorandum of it?—A. No, I do not think I have.

Q. One other question and then I am through. Between the 4th of January and the 15th day of February, as to all of your instructions, I take it the reason for their not being on file, all of them, is that they were given to the officials out there, verbally?—A. No; we do not give them verbally, usually, except when it is urgent then by telephone and we confirm them.

Q. That is all I want to get; where are those letters or instructions confirming the telephone conversations? They are not here on the record. Where are they?—A. I doubt if there would be one of mine, because I moved out to Regina almost immediately.

Q. But that would be a matter for the Department of Agriculture, would it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you not provide the committee with memoranda, your letters confirming your instructions or confirming conversations that you had with those officials in Regina between the 4th of January and the 15th of February?—A. If they are not on the record, there were no instructions sent.

Q. Do you not keep copies of those letters?—A. We do, for sure.

Q. Are there no copies on your file indicating any instructions from the 4th of January to the 15th of February?—A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. And you have not one memorandum in writing—is this correct—in which you set out the conversations or instructions which you gave during that entire period?—A. I do not recall issuing any instructions except regarding the report of Dr. James.

Q. Oh, all right? Was that done on the 4th of January?—A. Yes; and the other reports came in regularly.

Q. So, between the 4th of January and the 15th of February, you never wrote one letter to any of your officials in Regina or in the field regarding this matter?—A. That could be so, because four days previous to the 16th or the 15th, I was on vacation; and I was in Regina on the 17th.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Thank you very much.

By Mr. Murray (Cariboo):

Q. How many telephone calls were there put in between here and Regina in January and February dealing with this subject?—A. There were quite a number.

Q. Could you provide us with the number and the cost of the tolls, and the time spent?—A. I expect we could.

Mr. BROWNE: And a memorandum of the conversations?

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Stewart.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. You have mentioned these cases in January. I understand there were only 11 cases at the end of January.—A. I believe that is correct.

Q. Would those be on different farms?—A. Yes, they would be at different places.

Q. And of those 11 you picked out three cases that were diagnosed, and on which tests were made?—A. Yes, that would be so.

Q. And you would naturally pick the worst ones, I presume, the most suspicious.—A. They would try to pick cases where the lesions were recent, in order to get satisfactory material to use.

Q. Then, in February, up to the 11th, I understand there were only five cases?—A. I believe that is correct; but I would have to refer back.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. Were there any cases in the first two weeks of January?—A. Yes, there were some. Oh, I beg your pardon: the first part of January was very quiet; there was nothing much.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. There was nothing at the 1st of January. Well, going back to December, there were only 3 cases in December?—A. No, four cases.

Q. Four cases; and you have mentioned those 5 cases in February, up to the 11th; now, you were out there, were you not, early in January?—A. Yes, I was out in January.

Q. And you were out again in February?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you meet the minister, the Hon. Mr. Nollet, the provincial minister of agriculture?—A. I met Mr. Nollet in January.

Q. And did you meet his deputy minister, Mr. Horner, out there?—A. Yes I did.

Q. And did you have conversations with them?—A. Yes.

Q. And in those conversations did they in any way warn you or lead you to believe that there was any dire foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan?—A. No, definitely not.

Q. They did not; or did any of the officials of their department, or any of their veterinary officials do so.—A. No.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Charlton.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Mr. Chairman, it is almost 1 o'clock, but I would like to ask Dr. Childs a question before that time. Dr. Childs, the first intimation you had of this condition, of course, was on the 7th of December, was it not? The first return made to you here in Ottawa?—A. The report is dated, I believe, the 2nd of December, the first report.

Q. It was reported to you on the 2nd, here in Ottawa?—A. No. The report would not reach us on the 2nd; it would be a couple of days later; but the report was dated the 2nd of December.

Q. The report to you from Regina was dated the 2nd of December?—A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. Then, you say the first examination was on the 1st, and I understand that Dr. Carlson and Dr. James visited the Waas farm, is that true?—A. I think you will find they first visited there on the 2nd.

Q. Yes. The first report is dated the 2nd.—A. Hunter and Carlson.

Q. And immediately upon receipt of the telephone call from Dr. Hunter, they called Dr. James and arrangements were made for him to conduct an

examination without delay. Dr. Hunter had been called to the case on the previous evening. You say it is Dr. Hunter and Dr. James, or Dr. Carlson?—A. Dr. Carlson.

Q. Dr. Carlson signed the report on that particular day.—A. That is right.

Q. And in Dr. Carlson's report, Dr. Childs, did he not give you any indication which you felt warranted your taking the view that this thing was of a serious nature?—A. I would consider any vesicular condition serious enough to hold by quarantine until we found out whether or not it was serious.

Q. You did not consider it serious enough at that time?—A. Yes, I would consider any vesicular condition to be serious.

Q. Well, Dr. Carlson sent his report, and after realizing the danger, and after the results of a field diagnosis, in the case of a disease of a vesicular nature such as this, it was decided to contact Dr. Childs, the Veterinary Director-General, for further directions and advice. And following this, Dr. James was detailed to quarantine the premises and keep a close watch on them, as well as on neighbouring premises. That was a telephone call you had from Dr. Carlson, apparently.—A. I expect it was. Does it say so there?

Q. He says: "following this phone call", it is suggested here that you contact Dr. Childs for further directions and advice; and following this phone call Dr. James was detailed to quarantine the premises and keep a close watch.—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore there was a telephone call between Dr. Carlson and yourself?—A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. Do you remember that conversation?—A. I do not recall it now any more than it was generally along this line: quarantine; keep it under observation; and I believe I said that they had better inoculate a horse.

Q. You said they had better inoculate a horse?—A. Yes.

Q. And that is all you can remember? You did not keep any memorandum of that telephone conversation at all?—A. No, I do not think we did, no.

Q. But did Dr. Carlson not mention in his telephone call that there might be a suspicion of foot and mouth disease?—A. No.

Q. You say he did not mention that at all?—A. Not that I recall, no.

Q. And at no time before February 2, as Dr. Taggart said yesterday, at no time previous to February 2, did any veterinary, whether he belonged to the services or not, mention to you that this could be foot and mouth disease?—A. No, I do not recall anything like that.

Q. You do not recall anything?—A. No.

Q. Then no one at any time told you, or suggested to you previous to February 2, as Dr. Taggart said, or Mr. Young had mentioned to you at that time, that it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. No.

Q. But previous to that time no one even suggested it to you?—A. No.

Q. But in several of these reports the nature of this disease is suspected as being a vesicular disease. Here is one dated December 3 and signed by N. V. James and it says:

... all the cows exhibited stiffness in gait when walking. I gathered some discharge and sloughed membrane from the worst cases in cows mouths and applied this material to the mouths of two horses bruising it in vigorously on their tongues and lips in an effort to transmit the disease to horses.

You said a few minutes ago that you did not know too much about the difference in diagnoses of these two diseases in answer to Mr. Bennett, I believe. Is that a recognized method, Dr. Childs, with respect to different diagnoses in relation to vesicular diseases?—A. That is one of the methods.

Q. You say that is one of the methods?—A. Yes.

Q. To inoculate one horse?—A. One or two horses.

Q. By the scarification method?—A. Yes.

Q. But in the case of vesicular stomatitis, for instance, how long would you consider that the horse—after having been inoculated or infected in that way—how long a time would you consider was required before you got symptoms at all of vesicular stomatitis?—A. Anytime up to a week, I would say.

Q. Does vesicular stomatitis affect horses more than it does cattle?—A. Some types affect horses more, I believe, than they do cattle; but there are some types that affect both.

Q. Is not vesicular stomatitis known as “the” horse disease?—A. It is a horse disease, but it is also a cattle and a swine disease.

Q. But it is known as “the” horse disease, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. And you think it would take any time up to a week for that disease to be manifest in horses, after being directly inoculated on the tongue?—A. Yes, it might.

Q. “It might,” you say; sure, anything might. But what, in your opinion, would be the longest time that would warrant it?—A. I would not go more than a week, not more than a week.

Q. What was the shortest time in which it could appear?—A. Possibly inside of 48 hours.

Q. The shortest time in which it could appear?—A. Yes, I would think so.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, before we adjourn for lunch, it has been brought to my attention that Dr. Mitchell, chief of the division of Animal Pathology, has an important date for a meeting tomorrow with the United States officials of the Defence Research Board, and if it is the desire of the committee Dr. Mitchell could give evidence this afternoon, or possibly not until next Monday. I thought I would draw that to the attention of the committee so that while Dr. Mitchell is here today, if it is thought desirable, we could have him go on with his evidence, if we intend to meet this afternoon. What is your pleasure in that regard?

Mr. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, I rather not break up this questioning now. I think it would be preferable to leave Dr. Mitchell until Monday, if that would be suitable for Dr. Mitchell.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the committee?

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: What time shall we meet this afternoon, 4 o'clock?

Agreed.

The committee adjourned to meet again at 4 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please, gentlemen. I think Mr. Gardiner has a statement to make.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I want to call the attention of the member for Lake Centre to the fact that that report he asked for in the house a few moments ago, and which he asked for this morning, is already on the record. It is item No. 34. It is really a pathological report instead of a chemical report.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My No. 34 has consignee and contents.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, anyway, my officials here tell me it is on there, and in here it is marked.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, it is not on this one. All it sets out here at page 34 is consignees between January 23 and February 19.

Mr. JUTRAS: Which document is that?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The document filed in the House of Commons.

Mr. JUTRAS: Is it No. 169-F?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, this is the one that the minister tabled today? I have No. 34.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It is right here in this document.

Mr. JUTRAS: That is not document 169-F, Mr. Diefenbaker.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am told it is in the one that went to the house the other night.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is not, though.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There is a whole pile of them with it right here. These are stencilled copies of the one tabled in the house the other night.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This was a copy furnished by the department and also the one I got in the sessional papers office.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: These are stencilled from what I tabled in the house the other night.

Mr. BENNETT: Are those stencil copies available now to the committee?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Yes, we can have those distributed as far as they will go.

One of the officials tells me here that he raised the question of distributing these here this morning with the secretary and he was told that that is all printed in the printed record somewhere.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have not that document at all. You see where the difficulty comes in is that the numbers are all changed. One set is given to me with No. 34 and it is No. 32 in the other set.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: As long as you have it, that's the main thing.

Mr. McCUBBIN: I want to raise a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday when I was absent from the city the hon. member for Middlesex East asked Mr. Taggart a question, and I am going to read the question:

By Mr. White:

Q. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the minister, the Honourable Mr. Winters was acting Minister of Agriculture; was he informed of the developments? Or the parliamentary assistant to the minister, was he also advised at that time? Then I have another question to ask.

The other question read this way:

Q. It was naturally to be expected though that he would know about it?

To the first question Mr. Taggart had answered that he did not know whether I had been told about it or not, that he was not sure.

I want to notify the committee that I had been told; on February 18 I came to Ottawa and was informed by officials of the department that there might be an outbreak of foot and mouth disease but that they would not be sure till the end of the week. I want to say that was the first day I was told about it and I had no prior knowledge about it till that day.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Charlton, you have the floor.

Mr. CHARLTON: Just previous to the adjournment at one o'clock I had been questioning Dr. Childs.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please, gentlemen.

Mr. CHARLTON: During his questioning Dr. Childs was quite definite that no other vets, either working for the department or outside the department, had ever mentioned to him that this might be, might be, foot and mouth

disease. Now, I just want to quote what the minister said in the House of Commons, on page 48 of *Hansard*, dated March 3, and to be fair I want to read the whole paragraph because it would not make sense just reading one part. It is in answer to Mr. Knight, referring to Dr. Miller, who is the provincial veterinarian in Saskatchewan. It reads:

Mr. Gardiner: It would be impossible for me to know that. I only know that in Saskatchewan and every other province it has been the practice that all cases of serious disease are reported to the provincial department. I think it is the general practice that where there is any suspicion in connection with a disease they submit samples to wherever such investigations are carried out, and I understand that in Saskatchewan that place is Saskatoon. That was the case in my day, and I think it still is. I venture to suggest that what happened was the very thing that happens here every day. Everybody was talking about foot-and-mouth disease. The Canadian Press went to the university and asked the only authority they could find there, Dr. Miller, what were his views on the question, and he suggested that it was this other disease. I do not know whether that meant he had gone down personally and investigated. As will be found in *Hansard*, I said I did not know anything about that, that the only thing I had seen was an item in the press to the effect that it probably was not foot-and-mouth disease at all, in spite of what some of our own officials were saying at that time.

Now, obviously the minister had heard at that time from some of his officials—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That was some time in the 20's and that statement was made in Vancouver when I was out there.

Mr. CHARLTON: This statement was made on the 3rd March in the House of Commons.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, the statement made by Dr. Miller that I was referring to was made in Vancouver after everybody knew the disease was there.

Mr. CHARLTON: Did you know at the time you were in Vancouver there was danger?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I had the same report made to me on the 18th that was made to Mr. McCubbin and, as I say, the press was discussing it all over the country, and some member of the press went to Dr. Miller and asked him.

Mr. CHARLTON: And you thought it was foot and mouth disease?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He apparently thought it was stomatitis.

Mr. CHARLTON: But you knew?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, I did not. I said it had been reported to me that there was a possibility that it might be, just the same as it was reported to Mr. McCubbin on that same day. Not only did they write me by air mail, but they took the trouble to telephone me that that might be the case, but it was not proven and they simply were notifying me; for the first time I had heard of it as a possibility of foot and mouth disease.

Mr. CHARLTON: In spite of what some of our own officials might say at that time, which would lead us to believe that some of the officials knew it was foot and mouth disease.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Most of our officials must have had the idea on the 18th February of the possibility of it being foot and mouth disease, or they would not have been notifying the United States, and everybody else, including myself.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is what I want to make clear. Quite a few officials must have known about it long before that or they would not have been making these inoculations. They must have been thinking because in some of the reports I will say this, apthous fever is the usual form of foot and mouth disease.

Mr. BENNETT: Who is giving evidence here? Are we here to listen to argument or to facts?

Mr. CHARLTON: I am just trying to point out that I personally have other veterinarians here to give information and we will then see if the veterinary director general was or was not advised earlier as to this information on foot and mouth disease. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask Dr. Childs who answered the questions that I had on the order paper, for instance on March 3, regarding this disease, because there are some questions there that are answered just the same way they were answered in the committee this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: We will ask Dr. Childs to answer.

Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, recalled:

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Did you answer those questions?—A. What questions are you referring to?

Q. Any questions that come from the House of Commons to the department would naturally be answered by you?—A. No, not all questions. I usually look them over, though.

Q. Are you at this time, Dr. Childs, satisfied that what the disease actually was in the Waas herd in early December of last fall— —A. No, I am not altogether satisfied.

Q. You are not satisfied yet? Well, then, on March 24 I asked a question in the House of Commons, and I will read the question. It appears in *Votes and Proceedings of March 24*. Question 1. What was the final disposition of the herd of cattle belonging to Leonard Waas, McLean, Saskatchewan?—

This question was answered by Mr. McCubbin as follows: Slaughtered and buried March 14th.

Question No. 2. What are the particulars of the several tests made on the Waas herd, the sequence and dates on which each was conducted, and the results or reports made on each of said tests? I will now read the answer to that question. On December 3rd, two horses of Leonard T. Waas were inoculated with material collected from diseased animals in Waas' herd. Observations on December 4th, 5th and 6th showed no symptoms of lesions, but on December 8th several vesicles believed to be stomatitis were found on tongues and gums. A report was made each day to Regina and in turn to Ottawa. Blood samples were taken from the Waas cattle, and inoculations were made on these cattle on Sunday, March 9, 1952, for research and investigational studies. These studies are complementary and not complete. Therefore, interpretation cannot yet be made.

Now, I was not satisfied with the answers to those questions and I put two more questions on the order paper, which appear in *Votes and Proceedings* on March 27. These questions were as follows: Question 1. Was the herd of cattle belonging to Leonard Waas, McLean, Saskatchewan, ever at any time since last December, challenged with the virus of foot and mouth disease to prove or disprove the existence of that particular disease within the herd? Question No. 2. What was the exact nature of the inoculations made on these cattle on March 9, 1952, and what were the results which led to their ultimate slaughter and burial on March 14, 1952?

The one answer I got to these two questions reads as follows: The Waas herd was ordered slaughtered along with several others which had shown similar symptoms, but before the slaughter order of this herd was carried out blood samples were taken and the animals inoculated with live foot and mouth virus for experimental purposes. Tests have not been completed.—A. I would refer you to Dr. Mitchell to answer that question. That is in his hands to handle that.

Q. Did the cattle not show clinical symptoms at the time they were slaughtered after being inoculated with foot and mouth disease?—A. I did not see the cattle.

Q. You did not see the cattle; but naturally there would be a report brought in on them?—A. That report would be given by Dr. Mitchell. That is in his hands.

Q. Was Dr. Mitchell on the ground to see those cattle?—A. No.

Q. Then how could a clinical report be made out by Dr. Mitchell who had not seen the animals?—A. The clinical report was not made out by Dr. Mitchell but by our man who conducted this work, a Mr. Brown.

Q. These cattle were challenged with virus of foot and mouth disease, were they not?—A. So I believe.

Q. But you do not know what the result of that test was, yet?—A. As far as I know it was inconclusive; some animals showed lesions, and some did not.

Q. There was no report made on that test?—A. Yes, a report was made on it.

Q. Where is that report?—A. I think it is in your hands; I think you must have it there.

Q. Well, I asked for it, of course, and I did not get it. If you would produce that report now it might be very interesting because there must be some report, some clinical manifestations, when that herd was inoculated with virus of foot and mouth disease?—A. Surely!

Q. I would expect you as Veterinary Director-General to know what happened.—A. I know there were a number of animals positive, which showed lesions, and a number which did not.

Q. I would like to have the report of what animals showed lesions, as you say, and what animals did not. How many animals showed lesions and how many did not show lesions? I think we should have the report now.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You will get that from Dr. Mitchell.

Mr. CHARLTON: The clinical report could not be made by Dr. Mitchell.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Dr. Mitchell is not even under Dr. Childs; he is in another branch of the department; but he will be here to give evidence and you can get that from him.

Mr. CHARLTON: This has nothing to do with Dr. Mitchell's department because Dr. Mitchell is giving a report on blood samples sent down here, but not on the clinical report which must have been taken in the field before the animals were shot on the 14th.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: This last work was done entirely under Dr. Mitchell's direction. You are talking about the first.

Mr. CHARLTON: Are you not getting the record all screwed up? My question was quite plain. I simply asked what happened to these cattle which were inoculated on the 9th day of March and which were supposed to have vesicular stomatitis? Nobody has admitted as yet, in the House of Commons—but it has been admitted outside—that this herd was definitely afflicted with foot and mouth; but not in the House of Commons or here in the committee yet, that the herd was challenged with the virus of foot and mouth disease. What happened? Where is the report? That is what we want to see.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I again rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am speaking about the report. That report is not on this record. I asked for the production of it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You asked for the production of all the records down to the 12th of March, and you said you would be satisfied with them; and that report is not in yet.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: A moment ago the minister would lead the committee to believe that the record is here, but it is not.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am not going to allow that to stand, Mr. Chairman. My hon. friend knows that I asked him definitely yesterday—not here in the committee, but personally—“Will you be satisfied with all the reports down to the 12th of March?”

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is right.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: And you said “Yes”.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is right.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: And this report could not possibly have been in by that time.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That was a conversation and I never deny a conversation; and I said that I would be satisfied with the filings up to the 12th and I asked for the record still to be lived up to in the House, with the production of the rest of these reports, and the clinical examination.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It is not required under anything that has been ordered up to date. You do not make reports before you inject the virus into the animal and let it operate. It could not possibly have been there, no matter on what date it was injected; but I went further than that with my hon. friend, and I do not want him to build up the idea here that he is being denied something, and that is what he is doing. I stated to him that he could have everything down to today if he wanted it, and he said that all he wanted was down to the 12th and I said if there is anything later, you may still get it. I will leave it to this committee and to the hon. member's actions before this committee to determine what is going to be spread all over this country with regard to this disease.

Mr. LAING: It has already been spread all over the country as it is.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am not prepared to take the responsibility of having it spread all over the place.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is no question of spreading anything all over the country. What is at stake now is that we get the information, and the full information with regard to these clinical examinations. What we are trying to find out is what steps are necessary to prevent the spread of this disease all over the country.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that Mr. Charlton has yet finished.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. I think that report should be made available to this committee. I asked for it in my question and I did not get it. I think it is owing to us to know just exactly what was the disease in the Waas herd in December. There are ways you can tell, and those methods apparently were used to determine the facts. Now, we want the results. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Childs made a statement that there were no pronounced lesions, and that the symptoms were typical in the herds last December. Now the reports suggest, as I said earlier—some of the reports—I cannot go through them all in a moment—but some of the reports mentioned apthous fever. Would Dr. Childs think that mention of apthous fever would not give him some idea that foot and mouth disease was present?—A. Yes, I would think foot and mouth disease, sure enough.

Q. Still, these tests were made, with injection of horses; they were made on December 2, as I understand it, when 2 horses were inoculated; and it was given to us this morning that another inoculation was made on December 12, I believe. It was one of the herds on the Wood farm, and I take it there was no reaction in that case, with respect to those herds, was there?—A. The statement is “no reaction observed.”

Q. No reaction observed on the 12th; that is, other than the horses which were inoculated on the 12th of December, there were no other inoculations until February 12, on the Hahn farm, where 1 horse was inoculated? Where were these horses procured?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. I asked where these horses were procured?—A. From the same premises, I believe.

Q. On the same premises?—A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. And of what age were they?—A. I have not got that figure at hand.

Q. Would it not appear to be advisable to bring horses in from a little further way, in case they had been on the premises long enough to have had a touch of the disease previously?—A. It would probably be wiser, but if they had had it recently, they would show indications by scarring.

Q. Yes, if they had had the disease recently, but you would not expect them to have it again?—A. No, naturally.

Q. And if they were on the same property, would it appear to you to be a good idea to take those horses from the same property, regardless of age?—A. It is not the best idea, no.

Q. No. It is better to bring horses from a distant area, from an outside area where they could not possibly have had contact at all, and preferably younger animals?—A. Yes, young animals.

Q. You do not know the ages of these horses that were used?—A. No, I do not.

Q. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it was up to the director-general to find out what was being done at that time. Of course, there were his own instructions to the veterinarians under the date of April 18, 1951, circular No. 32, dated Ottawa, April 18; and those instructions which were sent out under Dr. Childs' own signature; and here is one. I shall not read the whole thing, it is not necessary. But here are one or two things: “stiffness and lameness which usually appear shortly after a rise of temperature may be mistaken for a form of Caminitis, during the early stages of the disease. Stiffness and lameness; I want to make sure the committee hears that part. In several of these reports, Mr. Chairman, stiffness and lameness is mentioned, in reports from the veterinarians in that district. Here are some, further on: diagnosis is formed by animal inoculation carried out at the site of the outbreak, or the suspected outbreak, test animals being brought in from a distance, from areas where vesicular diseases have not existed; the actual test inoculations to be carried out by specially trained veterinarians. Why was not that done?—A. We assumed that our instructions were carried out as nearly as possible with what material was available.

Q. Do you mean to say there were no horses available outside the district?—A. There would be horses available at some place.

Q. It specifies just that animals are to be brought in; it does not specify anything about horses. As a matter of fact, there should be other animals used besides horses; but it says “animals being brought in from a distance from areas where vesicular diseases have not existed.” But that was not done.

—A. Not in this case, but in other cases it was.

Q. Which cases?—A. The animals used at the Legislative Grounds at Regina on the 18th, and later on the 23rd and 24th; those were brought in from a distance.

Q. What age were they?—A. Young cattle; 1 about 6 or 8 months old; and the other somewhere around a year; and a couple of swine about 3½ to 4 months old.

Q. Then further on it says that practitioners should keep in mind that any vesicular disease of animals may be very serious and it should be promptly reported to the nearest departmental veterinarian who will appreciate your co-operation in taking appropriate measures to prevent the spread; diagnosis must be established on the premises where the disease is found. Why do you consider that was important, when this is the only case where I can find that particular statement in any bulletin or pamphlet or booklet that I have read yet, where it is definitely stated by you here that diagnosis must be established on the premises where the disease is found?—A. Yes. We prefer that to get away from the danger of setting it up in another centre—infecting some place else—not moving the virus around.

Q. You prefer it, but you say here “diagnosis must be established—” and there is no preference. It is a “must”. Why did you make that statement?—A. I made that statement partly to head off people picking up samples and perhaps sending them and spreading the infection. I wanted to hold it down there and make a preliminary diagnosis on the premises.

Q. Do you mean individuals other than veterinarians?—A. No, some of the boys might not be just aware of the danger of collecting material and moving it around.

Q. Is that the reason you sent that wire on the 15th of February?—A. Pretty much, yes.

Q. Countermanded that order?—A. Pretty much.

Q. Had you not been in touch with Dr. Hall previous to your sending that wire?—A. Yes, I was.

Q. By telephone?—A. No, I think—

Q. Pardon?—A. I think in conversation.

Q. By telephone?—A. No, no; in the office.

Q. Personally?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. You said this morning you had not been back to the office until the 15th?—A. That is correct.

Q. And the first you found out about it was when you went back to get your mail in the office on the 15th?—A. That is correct.

Q. You talked to Hall that day in the office?—A. That day, yes.

Q. Did you not agree with him at that time that it was a good idea to send those samples?—A. I did not agree that it was a good idea to send the specimens. What I wanted to get was somebody from the laboratory to go out there and make the inoculations. There is a reason for that. Mr. Charlton and it is this. You perhaps know that shortly after the vesicles break in foot and mouth disease it is a rather hard matter and it is dubious whether you can collect the virus in samples—the virus disappears rather rapidly and, by raising the disease in a fresh animal you are on the ground to get fresh material which you can handle then with a reasonable degree or reasonable chance of finding the virus.

Q. I so stated in the House of Commons.—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. I so stated in the House of Commons—what made it all the more serious was the diagnosis was not made at the time it was, when it should have been—because, having missed making that diagnosis at that time you cannot catch up with it later. That is what makes the situation much more serious than it would appear; but you apparently talked it over with Dr. Hall on the 15th of February and, although you did not send a wire from the office you, at home that evening, sent a wire countermanding the wire that the samples be down to the laboratory at Hull?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not send it from the office? You sent it from your home?—A. I think the thing there—

Q. Did Dr. Hall know you were going to send that?—A. No, I do not think he did.

Q. Had you mentioned that you might?—A. Possibly, I just do not recall now.

Q. Was Dr. Hall in charge in the office in your absence?—A. In my absence, yes.

Q. But you just took four days statutory leave at that time—and you were in charge on the 15th when you came back?—A. Yes.

Q. I understood you to say this morning that you just came in to get your mail and that you were still on statutory holidays. Were you still on statutory leave or did you come in to the office to work that day—or were you still on holidays?—A. I was still on holidays; but it seems to me I put in some time in the office when I became aware of the situation.

Q. That is natural—that when you came into the office you would spend some time. There were no more inoculations made then until the 12th of December when one horse was inoculated on the Wood farm, and then on the 28th day of December the Burns plant was put in quarantine, is that not right? The Burns feed lot and the packing plant on December 28th was quarantined by Dr. Christie?—A. No, the Burns feed lot was quarantined on December 28th.

Q. That is what I said.—A. You said the packing plant.

Q. I said the feed lot and the packing plant.—A. You can leave out the packing plant.

Q. Just the feed lot was quarantined?—A. Yes.

Q. The packing plant was not quarantined at that same time?—A. That is correct.

Q. Operations were continued at the Burns plant from the 28th of December on?—A. Yes.

Q. In the slaughtering part of the plant?—A. Yes.

Q. Operations were continued?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, that is different. When was that quarantine lifted on the Burns feed lot?—A. The 17th of January.

Q. And who lifted it?—A. That would be Dr. James.

Q. Dr. James lifted it himself?—A. He recommended that it be discontinued.

Q. Recommended that it be done?—A. Yes.

Q. You at that time were in Regina were you not?—A. Yes, I was in Regina.

Q. And you inspected Burns yard yourself?—A. Yes, I had looked them over.

Q. And were satisfied at that time there was nothing too serious about the infection there?—A. That is correct.

Q. At that time had anyone mentioned to you that it might still be foot and mouth disease that was present?—A. No.

Q. At any time?—A. At any time.

Q. And the quarantine was lifted on the Burns yard on the 17th. I understood it was on the Burns packing plant on the 28th but it apparently never was on the Burns packing plant, it was just on the yard—just on the feed lot.

Mr. STEWART: That has been answered.

Mr. CHARLTON: I just wanted to make sure. It is important.

Mr. MURRAY: This is something that should be discussed by the college of veterinarians and not by a parliamentary committee. It has to do with the veracity, honour, and character of the witness.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Did you, Dr. Childs—or when was the first time you advised the Hon. Mr. Gardiner about this epidemic? When was the first indication you yourself

gave the minister of this epidemic?—A. In my wire to the director which was filed about half past eleven on the 17th of February.

Q. You never discussed this with the minister during December and January at all?—A. No, we did not.

Q. You did not even discuss it with him?—A. No.

Q. You did not think it important even to discuss it with him or the deputy minister either?—A. No, we did not consider it was important at that time.

Q. Between the 4th of January and the 13th I believe of February, there is no correspondence to show anything took place between the department and officials—other than reports.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: That has been answered.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Nothing in writing between your office and the Regina office other than the ordinary weekly reports? Is that true?—A. Yes, and I think that has been answered already, has it not?

Q. Yes, I think it has but I just want to make sure that is true.

No word was transferred at all from your office to Regina in writing—nothing that could be given as evidence? And why was that? Why did you not want to put anything on paper?—A. There was no need to.

Q. And yet on the 1st or 2nd of February, as the deputy minister told us yesterday, you intimated to him and to Dr. Young that there might be some doubt in your mind as to whether this could be foot and mouth disease or not?—A. I do not recall that or that date. I do recall discussing this with Dr. Young and Mr. Taggart on the 2nd.

Q. You now say, or you say for instance that you did not tell him anything like that until the 15th?—A. I think I may be wrong there—possibly it was the 16th.

Q. The 16th?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not suggest to him at any time before that that it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. No, I do not believe I suggested to anybody that it was foot and mouth disease before that.

Q. According to the deputy minister's report, Mr. Taggart's report yesterday, you in company with Dr. Young, had intimated to him that there might be a possibility of foot and mouth disease in the Saskatchewan district. Is that true or not?—A. We probably talked of vesicular disease but I do not believe I used the words "foot and mouth disease" or even said I suspected it until the 16th.

Q. You did not even say you suspected it until the 16th?—A. I do not think I did—I cannot recall—I cannot recall any such thing.

Q. You went away on your holidays on the 9th?—A. I think you are wrong there again.

Q. Well, that is Saturday and you went on the 11th. It was the 11th you started but when you left the office on Saturday the 9th you would presumably not be back until the following Saturday or something like that?—A. That was the intention.

Q. Actually you started on your statutory leave on the 11th of February?—A. That is right.

Q. Now, on the 13th, as I understand it, there was a telephone call or a wire or some means of transmitting the word at least, by Dr. Carlson that there was some difference in the disease situation out there, and that there should be something done about it. Dr. Hall, being in charge at that time, contacted Dr. Mitchell and it was arranged that samples be sent down to Hull. That is correct, is it not?—A. I believe so.

Q. That was on the 13th and you did not know anything about that until you came in for your mail on the 15th?—A. That would be correct.

Q. And up until this time you had no suspicion whatever, no suspicion whatever that this would be foot and mouth disease?—A. No, I could not believe foot and mouth disease could occur out there.

Q. Now, on the 15th you talked to Dr. Hall and found out that these samples were being sent down and you disagreed with Dr. Hall about having them sent down and you sent a wire that night from your residence to Dr. Christie—yes, to Dr. Christie in Regina to the effect that the samples should be stopped and not sent to Hull?—A. In my wire, yes.

Q. And on the 16th you apparently flew to Regina, is that not correct?—A. We have been over that before, of course.

Q. Yes. I am going over it again, Mr. Chairman. On the 16th he flew to Regina, and on the 17th you visited the Burns yard and plant, and on the 18th you decided that it was foot and mouth disease and so instructed the United States, and instructed your office in Ottawa that it was?—A. No, we did not instruct anybody that it was foot and mouth disease at that time. We did not use that word yet.

Q. In your correspondence with Washington you used the words foot and mouth, isn't that so?—A. No, definitely not.

Q. You were satisfied in your own mind that it was foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes, I was, at that time.

Q. You were satisfied at that time?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, the animals were not inoculated until the 18th, I understand that that is when the inoculation took place, not until the 18th? Is that not true?—A. That is correct.

Q. Dr. Childs, what led you to believe on the 18th that it was foot and mouth disease?—A. Because, as I pictured the situation, it was showing more malignancy and more of a tendency to spread, and the reports of our men there.

Q. But you did not take any time then, you immediately thought that it was foot and mouth disease?

The CHAIRMAN: He said that was on the 18th.

The WITNESS: No, we did not say that it was foot and mouth disease, not until all the evidence was in.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. In your wire to Mr. Young did you mention that you thought that it was foot and mouth disease?—A. It did not say foot and mouth disease.

Q. Well, you probably didn't use that term, but— —A. No.

Q. But you certainly intimated in the wire you sent to the United States that there was a dangerous vesicular disease here in Canada? Now, mind, up until this time, vesicular stomatitis is not dangerous; and, of course, your wire—that is, the one from Dr. Ray—a vesicular disease in cattle in Regina—very suspicious; very suspicious, is the word he uses there; so it would lead anyone to believe that certainly there was some thought in your mind regarding this particular stomatitis, and that is the only reason you changed your mind about the disease; that there was a little more spread? And yet you told us this morning there were only 12 outbreaks in the first half of February and there were eleven outbreaks in January. Not so much difference there?—A. That is subject to correction. I was speaking from memory there. We have all those dates and the numbers concerned. I might read this.

Q. You want to correct the evidence you gave this morning?—A. I will read this all, if you wish.

Q. All right.

Mr. STEWART: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the witness speak a little louder. Some of the members at the end of the table have complained that they cannot hear.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is that material, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that is from their official records.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is your official record throughout the whole course of the proceedings?

The WITNESS: Yes, a report on our operations.

Mr. DECORE: Is it a part of the record, these documents he proposes to use?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. DECORE: Would you make it a part of the record?

The CHAIRMAN: It can be made a part of the record. I suppose that it might be as well to hear this right now.

The WITNESS: This is quite a lengthy document, gentlemen. I will read the headings:

L. T. Waas, McLean, December 1:

Factual data from reports:

Reported by Dr. H. Hunter December 1. Examined by Drs. Hunter and Carlson, December 2. Tentatively diagnosed vesicular stomatitis. Advised V.D.G. by phone and requested further instructions. Instructed to quarantine premises and keep premises and neighbouring premises under observation. On December 3 Dr. James quarantined premises and inoculated two horses as a field test. On December 8 first symptoms of vesicular stomatitis observed on two horses—several small vesicles found on tongues and gums. Quarantine lifted December 8.

Inspections:

Observed December 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15.

Possible source of infection:

1. Immigrant farm labourer W. Bruentjen arrived November 2, left November 5.

2. Delivered calves to Burns and Company November 22, four days later his herd showed symptoms of infection.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered March 13, 1952, 38 cattle, 3 swine. Delay in slaughter due to research and investigation studies conducted. Blood samples taken March 4 from animals. Live virus inoculation March 8, 1952.

L. Wood, Qu'Appelle, December 12:

Factual data from reports:

Reported infection December 12. Inspection by Dr. James disclosed evidence of vesicular stomatitis. Premises quarantined and horses inoculated with material from infected animals. Quarantine lifted December 22.

Inspections:

Observed December 12, 14, 15, 20, 22 and February 18, 19.

Possible source of infection:

Wood had helped L. Waas treat animals November 30. Wood first noticed infection in his herd December 10—10 days after work at Waas farm.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered March 6, 1952. 52 cattle, 4 swine.

J. C. Smith, Edgley, December 14:

Factual data from reports:

Reported infection December 14. Dr. James visited premises December 14, diagnosed vesicular stomatitis and quarantined premises. Only one calf sick—others had been ill but responded to treatment. By December 22 all animals were healthy and quarantine lifted.

Inspections:

Observed December 14, 15, 20, 22. February 18, 19.

Possible source of infection:

Smith had assisted L. Waas in treatment of Waas cattle November 30. First noticed disease in his own cattle 11 or 12 days later.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered March 6, 1952, 32 cattle, 1 swine.

Mr. LAING: These cattle were to all intents and purposes healthy; they were slaughtered only because of the contact; is that right?

The WITNESS: Yes sir.

Burns and Company Stockyard, December 28:

Factual data from reports:

Burns management reported some cattle sick in stockyard and Dr. James visited premises and inspected 207 head of cattle—30 exhibiting symptoms of stomatitis. Quarantined premises and arranged for ante-mortem inspection of cattle about to be slaughtered. Symptoms of stomatitis (slight) found on post-mortem. Inspections of stock in yard—that should be “feed lot”—continue with cattle improving although well established in feeder cattle. No symptoms in hogs or sheep. On January 10 all animals but 3 in good condition and the 3 improving. On January 14 all animals in stock yards checked and no symptoms found. 3 steers and 3 heifers in feed lot showing lameness—appears to be ergotism but no traces of ergot in hay and chopped grain being fed. These lame steers and two of the heifers slaughtered—post-mortem examination diagnosed foot-rot responsible for lameness. On January 17 all animals inspected and in good health. The feet and rumens of a number of cattle slaughtered in the plant showed lesions and were given post-mortem examination by Drs. Childs, Carlson, Dryden and James. It was their opinion that foot lesions were caused by bacillus necroforus infection and rumen lesions the result of feeding spoiled, musty, low-grade grain. Recommended lifting of quarantine on premises. Vesicular disease noted again February 12. Carlson 'phoned Ottawa and Dr. Hall took call in Dr. Childs' absence and told Carlson he would wire. Wire despatched morning of February 13 ordering collection of samples for test at A.D.R.I. Samples collected on 13th and 14th and despatched as prescribed to Hull on February 14th. Received February 16th, animals inoculated that day and disease positively identified foot and mouth disease type A and official announcement made February 25th. Burns and Company stock and premises quarantined February 18th. February 22nd Drs. Saint and Shahan (U.S. Bureau A.I.) visited premises for purpose of securing specimens for further investigation into disease.

Inspections:

Observed December 28, 30, 31. January 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17. February 13, 14, 18, 22, 28, 29.

Possible source of infection:

5 calves delivered to yards by L. T. Waas on November 23, 1951, killed November 23. At this time Waas walked all through Burns yard. Cattle sickness first noticed in Burns stockyard December 18, 25 days following passage through the yards of Waas cattle. Lengthy incubation period but cattle were continually going for slaughter and in all probability first cattle infected by Waas' calves were killed before clinical symptoms of disease appeared. As the disease spread in the holding pens the clinical symptoms became apparent until December 18

the foreman drew the management's attention to the number of sick cattle. Purchased 3 head cattle from H. Beatty February 4. Beatty's cattle had shown signs of disease January 29.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered February 29, 1952: 74 cattle, 11 sheep, 57 lambs.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. You referred to the feed lots, aren't they far apart?—A. Not very far apart. They are fairly close there.

R. Clifton, Regina, December 29.

Factual data from reports:

Visited by Dr. James who diagnosed stomatitis and quarantined premises. Cattle reported as being treated and proper sanitary measures being taken. On Jan. 21 cattle completely recovered and quarantine lifted.

Inspections:

Observed Dec. 29-31; Jan. 2-5-21.

Source of infection:

Not determined. Owner reported that he had not visited any premises where this disease was known to exist.

Frequent visitor to Hanley barns later established as infected Dec. 15th.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered Feb. 29; 6 cattle.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. These diseases were definitely not foot and mouth disease, otherwise the animals would not have recovered.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: That's not right.

MR. LAING: I am not asking you. I am asking Dr. Childs. These animals at that stage were definitely not affected with foot and mouth disease, otherwise they would not have recovered. At this stage those animals were diagnosed as being completely free of disease, so that they would not have foot and mouth disease. Is that correct or could they have recovered from foot and mouth disease?

The WITNESS: They probably had foot and mouth disease.

MR. LAING: They could have recovered from foot and mouth disease in that period?

The WITNESS: Yes, that is quite so. So much for Clifton. Note that phrase "Frequent visitor to Hanley barns" because that will come up later. You will note here, gentlemen, that there were no cases appeared, brought to our notice, or seen, between December 29 and January 23, I believe it is.

Now we come to H. Barre, Regina, January 23.

Factual data from reports:

Following report by Dr. Hunter, Dr. James accompanied by Dr. Dosch, Dr. Hunter's assistant, visited above premises, diagnosed stomatitis and Dosch prescribed treatment. Premises quarantined. In subsequent visits sick cattle are responding to treatment.

Inspections:

Jan. 23-25-29.

Possible source of infection:

Not established but disease prevalent in area and possibly visiting neighbours carried disease.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered Feb. 29; 40 cattle.

By Mr. Bennett:

Q. What did Dr. Childs say about no cases being reported there? I did not catch that remark, Mr. Chairman.—A. No cases were reported between December 29 and January 23.

Q. There could have been cases that were not reported, I presume?—A. Definitely, definitely. But there were not.

The WITNESS: This is J. M. Moore, Regina, January 25.

Factual data from reports:

Dr. James visited premises and found 19 cattle suffering from stomatitis in different stages. Other livestock appeared healthy. Premises quarantined and owner advised about treatment. On Feb. 11 James and Carlson visited premises—nearly all cattle recovered. Owner reported that 2 horses had become very listless and refused feed for some days but were then apparently recovered.

Inspections:

Jan. 25; Feb. 11.

Possible source of infection:

A bull first infected Jan. 21. Believed infection brought to bull by Moore himself from some untraced source as bull was tied up and given individual attention.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered March 2; 19 cattle, 9 swine.

W. J. Bickley, Lumsden, January 28.

Factual data from reports:

Visited premises Jan. 28 and found 1 yearling steer suffering from stomatitis—all other stock appeared healthy (35 cattle, 4 horses).

Inspections:

Jan. 28.

Possible source of infection:

J. M. Moore a neighbour possible source of infection.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered Mar. 2; 36 cattle.

C. A. Clarke, Regina, January 29.

Factual data from reports:

Visited premises and found 5 of 12 cattle suffering stomatitis. Stiffness in gait and inability to eat properly was noticed in the one pig—no symptoms in the 2 horses.

Inspections:

Jan. 29.

Possible source of infection:

Several herds along Wascana Creek infected.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered Mar. 4; 11 cattle, 1 swine.

Alec Duck, Regina, January 31.

Factual data from reports:

Owner reported to Dr. Hewitt who in turn reported to district office. James visited premises examined 55 cattle, 2 horses—6 cattle had typical symptoms of stomatitis. Quarantined premises and advised owner as to treatment.

Subsequent visit Feb. 4 through Feb. 9th—almost the entire herd infected a few new cases each day. Cattle being treated in ordinary way and improving from day to day. Few cases have developed swellings in the legs and sores between the toes which appears to be foot rot but these cases have responded to treatment by washing thoroughly with antiseptic solutions and applying oil of tar to the affected parts. Subsequent visits found cattle recovering slowly from acute symptoms observed. No ulcers found on feet or legs. Several cows developed hardened udders in one quarter—disappears in few days with treatment of hot fomentations and infusion of penicillin. On Feb. 12 one milk cow died suddenly from what appeared to be severe heart attacks. Infection appears to be very virulent.

Inspections:

Jan. 31, Feb. 4-5-6-7-8-9-12-13-16-19-20.

Possible source of infection:

A brewer's wet grain customer of John Haun. Infection probably carried from Hanley farm by John Haun.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered Feb. 29; 60 cattle.

R. E. Wagner, Regina, January 31.

Factual data from reports:

Visited premises and examined 5 cattle and 1 horse. All cattle infected with stomatitis, 1 month old calf died within 3 days after becoming infected by drinking milk from cow which was suffering from a severe attack of stomatitis. Quarantined premises and advised owner about treatment.

On Feb. 11, 3 cattle appeared completely recovered but 2 milk cows continue to have swellings above the hoofs, but no ulcers have appeared and severe lameness is evident. It appeared that the organism which caused disease in this herd was an unusually virulent type.

Inspections:

Jan. 31, Feb. 1-11.

Possible source of infection:

Believed carried from Barre premises by Dr. Dosch a private veterinarian. Dosch visited Barre place Jan. 18, 19 and 23rd and visited Wagner place Jan. 22 and 23rd. This last visit was directly from Barre premises.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered Feb. 29: 5 cattle.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. Who was the veterinarian in this case? On January 31.—A. Dr. Dosch. A private practitioner or in the employ of a private practitioner.

Q. He was called on January 31 and saw the five sick animals and sick horses?—A. Yes.

The WITNESS: We come now to K. Haun.

K. Haun, Regina, February 1.

Factual data from reports:

Visited premises and examined 37 cattle and 3 horses. 7 cattle had well-marked symptoms of stomatitis. Advised owner about treatment and quarantined premises. On visits Feb. 4 through Feb. 8 it was found that infection was spreading through herd until the entire herd was infected. Cattle recovering slowly. Few cows exhibited swellings and soreness in the feet above and between the hoofs. This condition is being relieved by antiseptic washes and the application of oil of tar. Subsequent visits found most animals recovering. Several still had sore feet with separation of hoofs at the heel and several with hardened and inflamed quarters of udders.

These conditions treated by warm antiseptic solutions and are recovering slowly. One calf 10 days old, in apparent good health, dropped dead suddenly after running and playing in the barn. Material from vesicles on an infected udder was experimentally introduced into the tongue and mouth of a horse. No symptoms, so again inoculated Feb. 16.

Inspections:

Feb. 1-4-5-6-7-8-12-13-16-18-19.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered Feb. 29; 40 cattle.

Mr. QUELCH: When you use the term "recovered" you mean that the symptoms disappeared or that the animal has fully recovered?

The WITNESS: The disease has probably disappeared.

Now we come to A. Clements, Regina, February 2:

Factual data from reports:

Visited premises inspected 21 cattle and 2 horses—found 6 cattle in barn infected with stomatitis. Advised re treatment and quarantined premises. Subsequent visits found all animals apparently healthy only two had had severe symptoms of stomatitis.

Inspections:

Feb. 2-7-12.

Date and number slaughtered:

Slaughtered March 3; 23 cattle.

E. H. Wobeser, Regina, February 4:

Factual data from reports: Visited premises inspected 3 cattle and one horse—one cow suffering from stomatitis. Advised re treatment and quarantined premises.

Inspections: February 4.

Possible source of infection: Contact with cattle at Dominion Live-stock Division barn on day barn was quarantined.

Date and number slaughtered: slaughtered March 2, 3 cattle.

M. H. Brown, Adams, February 11:

Factual data from reports: Visited premises with Dr. Carlson and questioned owner about reports that his cattle and horses had been infected with stomatitis and had been treated by a private veterinarian

and had failed to report to district veterinarian. Owner stated that his horses had not been infected and one animal in his herd had been sick for a few days but had recovered. No evidence of disease found on examination of the horses and cattle. Dr. Rankin visited Feb. 18 and on questioning owner he stated that on January 30 three of his cattle had refused to eat were drooling from the mouth and showed signs of lameness but at present all cattle were eating and showing signs of recovery. At time of this visit three animals were visibly lame and very reluctant to move. A thorough physical examination was made of the animals' mouths and in two cases small lesions were seen. One cow was swollen around the hoof head.

Inspections: February 11-18.

Date and number slaughtered: slaughtered March 2, 34 cattle and 10 swine.

C. F. Delarue, Regina, February 14:

Factual data from reports: Dr. Chambers while taking blood samples noticed cattle were having difficulty in drinking and considerable drooling, on examination found vesicles on the tongues and membranes and on one cow the whole tongue covering came off in his hand. No lesions were noticed on feet, none was lame, 15 hogs apparently healthy. Animal which had been bred to bull at exhibition grounds Feb. 1st appeared healthy and owner stated he never noticed any deviation from normal. Chambers believed she had had disease and recovered. Premises quarantined. Dr. Saint accompanied by Drs. Shahan and James visited premises February 22. No satisfactory material could be obtained for laboratory. Four hogs showed definite lameness and evidence of separation at coronary band. No lesions on snout were observed. These three visited again on February 23 and obtained suitable material from 1 calf.

Inspections: February 14-22-23.

Possible source of infection: 1 animal contact at exhibition grounds when bred to bull.

Date and number slaughtered: slaughtered March 3, 8 cattle and 9 swine.

M. E. Cook, Regina, February 14:

Factual data from reports: Visited and inspected 5 cattle and 1 horse. 1 cow infected with stomatitis with erosion of skin on tongue and several very sore ruptured vesicles on gums. Advised re-treatment and quarantined.

Inspections: February 14.

Possible source of infection: Sold bales of straw to K. Haun around end of January and Haun herd first showed clinical evidence of disease February 1. When Haun was buying straw he was in and around Cook's livestock.

Date and number slaughtered: Slaughtered March 3, 23 cattle.

H. Beatty, Adams, February 18:

Factual data from reports: Dr. Rankin visited premises. On questioning owner stated that on January 29 he noticed that some of his animals refused to eat, became stiff, sore feet and were drooling from the mouth. Stated all his cattle had been sick but were apparently recovering. At the time of visit all animals were able to eat but 5 cattle

were very stiff and lame and were very reluctant to arise or move around. A thorough physical examination was made of cattle mouths which revealed old lesions apparently recovering. Owner stated that he had not purchased any fresh meat but was using frozen meat produced on farm. 3 head of cattle sold to Burns & Co. February 4, 1952. No visitors had been in his barn for considerable time and no European immigrants employed on premises. Water supply taken from Wascana Creek. Premises quarantined.

Inspections: February 18.

Possible source of infection: Mr. Beatty stated he was on Brown farm on January 20 and Brown herd showed evidence of infection January 22 or 23. No doubt Beatty brought infection from Brown herd to his own.

Date and number slaughtered: slaughtered March 2, 32 cattle.

Wm. Hanley, North Regina, February 19:

Factual data from reports: Visited premises and inspected 176 cattle and 8 horses and found no symptoms of stomatitis or other disease. Owner stated that in December before Christmas several cattle became dull and listless and refused feed. One had a sore mouth and 1 cow had a small scab on one teat. These symptoms all cleared up in a few days and no further cases developed since then. Hanley supplies a number of cafes, hotels and creameries with milk also the Grey Nuns hospital in Regina and operates a pasteurizing plant. All cattle on premises in full milk flow and in excellent condition. Quarantined premises as a precaution.

Inspections: February 19.

Possible source of infection: Carl Palmateer, a dairy helper was working on the Waas farm during November and on the 26th he left and on November 27 started to work for Wm. Hanley. He wore the same overalls and overshoes as he had on the Waas premises. Hanley herd first showed evidence of infection on December 15th, 18 days following Palmateer arrival.

Date and number slaughtered: slaughtered March 3, 180 cattle.

You will observe that the herd was never reported to anybody, never seen or recorded until February 19. So I expect that this herd is responsible for the group infection of a very small area around those premises.

Mr. LAING: How did it come to the attention of others? Did he call a veterinary?

The WITNESS: No. There was a general inspection around there.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Did you say it was a dairy herd?

The WITNESS: A dairy herd.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. There was no general inspection until that time, February 19, no general inspection in that district?—A. No. Before that. This herd was inspected on December 15 but not reported.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Were any of those cattle shipped out anywhere?

The WITNESS: Yes. We will come to that in a moment.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Yes, and I will have some questions on that in a moment.

The WITNESS: Well then, we will come to it right away.

Demerse Brothers, Truax, February 19:

Factual data from reports: Dr. Saint visited premises. Found 12 cattle showing symptoms of vesicular stomatitis. Owner stated the animals were refusing feed and drinking very little water. On examination these animals showed lesions of the disease on the mucous membranes of the tongue and mouth but none on feet and none was lame. Three milk cows had temperatures of 103·2, 104 and 106 degrees. These animals definitely sick. Hogs and horses appeared normal. No sales or purchases of livestock by the owners in last 2 months. First noted in herd February 18, premises quarantined.

Inspections: February 19.

Possible source of infection: Cattle had been in contact with herd of J. Beingessner on February 11 and February 15. Together 24 hours before separated.

Date and number slaughtered: slaughtered March 4, 11 cattle, 1 swine.

J. J. Beingessner, Truax, February 19:

Factual data from reports: Dr. Saint visited and quarantined premises after examination. 19 cattle showing symptoms of stomatitis with vesicle formation and drooling. These animals not eating to any extent. No lesions on feet and none was lame. Other animals appeared normal.

Inspections: February 19.

Possible source of infection: 2 Holstein heifers were purchased from Hanley Dairy Farm and delivered February 8. First sickness appeared February 17.

Date and number slaughtered: Slaughtered March 4, 45 cattle, 2 swine.

South Saskatchewan Cooperative Stockyards, Moose Jaw, February 19:

Factual data from reports: Dr. Rankin and Dr. Brown examined cattle in these yards February 19 no sign of disease but quarantined as precaution. Dr. Brown visited on February 22 and 23—no evidence of disease and issued permit for removal of 8 cattle to Canada Packers, Moose Jaw, for immediate slaughter. On February 26 order issued for slaughter of 13 head belonging to Lister Bros. as 2 head had been purchased from Burns & Co. Regina Feb. 12. Inspections Feb. 28 and Feb. 29 disclosed no evidence of contagious disease. On March 5 orders issued for slaughter of certain cattle due to contact. Inspection March 6, no disease.

Inspections: Feb. 19-22-23-26-28-29, March 5-6.

Possible source of infection: contact.

Date and number slaughtered: Lister Bros. cattle slaughtered Feb. 29, 13 cattle. Following cattle slaughtered March 7, Canada Packers 1; R. Arnold, 4; S. Stern, 2; R. Triggs, 2; Sask. Co-op, sheep 9, swine 11; D. Gardner, sheep 3.

Fruman Bros., Regina, February 28:

Factual data from reports: Drs. Andrich and Donnelly visited and quarantined premises after examination of animals. No evidence of disease in owner's livestock and caretaker H. E. Wilson stated that he

saw no evidence of disease among his animals. R.C.M.P. informed Dr. Christie that Fruman Bros. had made statements about non-observance of regulations. Re-inspection March 7 disclosed symptoms of disease in cattle, foaming at mouth, ruptured vesicles and sore feet. Truck had been hauling fodder from brewery to stockmen in district and had been on Hanley Farm few days before quarantine.

Inspections: February 28, March 7.

Possible source of infection: Delivered fodder from brewery to Hanley farm around time of quarantine of Hanley farm. Owner himself had been in and around Burns and Co. stockyard and abattoir when infected animals probably there.

Date and number slaughtered: slaughtered March 11, 84 cattle.

C. Volpel, Regina, February 28:

Factual data from reports: Drs. Andrich and Donnelly visited premises, inspected livestock and questioned owner. Found no evidence of disease and owner stated he had not seen any evidence of disease. Reinspection March 7 disclosed no evidence of disease. Quarantined premises.

Inspections: February 28, March 7.

Possible source of infection: Contact. Had purchased calf from Burns on January 24.

Date and number slaughtered: slaughtered March 11, 7 cattle, 55 swine.

D. E. Stewart, Regina, February 29:

Factual data from reports: Inspection disclosed two calves lame—slight erosion on tongue of one calf. Owner stated calves not eating normally for over two weeks but no drooling. Quarantined and ordered slaughtered.

Inspections: February 29.

Possible source of infection: Calves purchased from K. Haun last purchase made early in December. Owner's son employed for past two months on Haun farm. Calves had been fed skim milk from Haun herd until February 1 or 2.

Date and number slaughtered, remarks: Slaughtered March 2, 9 cattle, 1 goat.

E. Cross, Regina, March 3:

Factual data from reports: Farm next to Hanley—the bigger dairy farm we were speaking about before—premises quarantined and order issued for slaughter.

Inspections: March 3.

Possible source of infection: Contact. Animals had been in contact with Hanley herd, owner had also visited on Hanley premises prior to quarantine.

Date and number slaughtered, remarks: Slaughtered March 3, 10 cattle, 1 swine.

D. Mironuck, Craven, March 3:

Factual data from reports: No evidence of disease and owner stated he had not seen any evidence. Premises quarantined and slaughter orders issued.

Inspections: March 3.

Possible source of infection: Contact. Owner purchased week-old calves from Hanley December 2, 1951, December 29, 1951 and January 11, 1952.

Date and number slaughtered, remarks: Slaughtered March 3, 20 cattle.

K. Slobolodyn, Regina, March 7:

Factual data from reports: Inspection of cattle showed lesions. Quarantine and slaughter orders issued.

Inspections: March 7.

Possible source of infection: Had purchased on December 10, 1951 and January 24, 1952 from Burns and Co.

Date and number slaughtered, remarks: Slaughtered March 11, 6 cattle, 5 swine.

K. C. Gillis, Gray, March 8:

Factual data from reports: Quarantined and slaughter order issued. Inspections: March 8.

Possible source of infection: Contact. Cow bred to bull on farm of Alec Duck January 30, 1952.

Date and number slaughtered, remarks: Slaughtered March 11, 12 cattle.

A. Kivol, Ormiston, April 19.

Factual data from reports: Inspection revealed symptoms of foot and mouth disease in six cattle. Drs. Carlson and Mulhern (U.S.A.) clinically diagnosed foot and mouth disease April 21.

Inspections: April 19-21-22-23.

Possible source of infection: Quarter of beef purchased from local butcher in December 1951. Bones thrown in yard used by animals.

Date and number slaughtered, remarks: Slaughtered April 24, 12 cattle, 1 swine.

Steve Christbason, Ormiston:

Factual data from reports: Neighbour of Alex Kivol.

Possible source of infection: Property not fenced and cattle wandered over to barnyard of Kivol. Direct contact.

Date and number slaughtered, remarks: Slaughtered April 24.

These reports are not all complete and I cannot give you the figure accurately but I think 13 cattle were slaughtered there. That is what we have in the records to date.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment before you ask the question. This report just given by Dr. Childs is a report of findings and dispositions and I would like the opinion of members of the committee on this. There have been many names of farmers mentioned in the report and what is your opinion as to the advisability of the names being made public?

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind if the names are stricken from the record and not made public but these names are public. I live in the

district and I know some of these people who are named. I do not think it makes a particle of difference whether those names are recorded or not. I think perhaps for purposes of identification we may have to use some of them.

The CHAIRMAN: I was thinking of the injury that might be done those men in the future in carrying on their livelihood.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If I might speak about that—it is the first time I have spoken in this connection.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like the committee to decide this issue right now.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I suggest if there is any question of that then call them “A” and “B”, “C”, “D” and then there is no difficulty at all.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I wish to speak on a point of order just before the minister. With respect to “A”, “B”, “C”, “D” I am perfectly satisfied. As a matter of fact I think I was one of those who mentioned in the House that we should not mention names. I also agree with the member from Acacia that after all some of the western farmers have a lot at stake in this but that is unfortunate. War is unfortunate, very unfortunate for some people—particularly mothers and children. Strikes are unfortunate, particularly for mothers and children. However, we have to protect the rest of the farmers and I am quite willing to have “A”, “B”, “C”, “D”, but, with respect to what Dr. Childs has said I am not satisfied. This is part of the same question—I am not satisfied that it should not be disclosed where certain of this beef was distributed.

If you will just bear with me a moment—I happen to be a layman and I am not a lawyer, a feed merchant or a druggist,—I happen to live on one of the largest dairy farms in British Columbia and with the member for Westminster, who is not a member of this committee, I represent 90 per cent of the dairy people of British Columbia. If it happens to hit our province and valley it means the loss of at least \$50 million to the people he and I represent.

For that reason I am particularly interested and this bears back to what Mr. Quelch said before. Dr. Childs, if I understood him correctly a moment ago, said that some of this beef, in frozen form I understand, had been sent from Burns on January 23rd, and according to the records I have here it was sent to Burns in Vancouver on January 25th.

Well, as I understand it—and as I say I am just a layman but I represent 90 per cent of the dairymen in the province of British Columbia in this case—the doctor himself, or if not the doctor or the minister one of the officials, said that bones or something else could distribute this disease. I understood that one of the officials, I think Dr. Childs himself said that.

Now, I am particularly anxious to know where these cattle came from which were sent to Burns in Vancouver on January 25th. What happened to the distribution of bones or any raw meat? I think of that when I have \$50 million worth of dairy cattle at stake in the Fraser Valley. Is there any possible spread of this? I realize the unfortunate spread and this bad advertisement you might call it for the Dominion of Canada, and I heard this morning about certain beef buyers in eastern Canada. They can fight for themselves and I will fight for my province.

We import white face and other cattle from Alberta and Saskatchewan to my province. We are going into beef now, and if this is going to endanger the stock—and I read in the record that this virus can even be spread in frozen beef—and if even freezing is of no value I, particularly as a layman, would like to see where there is no danger from the offal or other things from frozen beef endangering the beef cattle in my province.

I am not going to cry over spilled milk but if you want to put it in two words the department or certain officials of it were asleep at the post. However there is no use worrying about spilled milk.

I am particularly worried about the future and when I see on January 25th that frozen meat—I presume it was frozen—was imported into the city of Vancouver—to the Burns company there, I want to know, and I want to know from some authority here who knows more than I do—as I am only a layman—that there is no danger from some of the bones or raw meat being thrown out.

If I heard it from Dr. Childs correctly, and if I understood it correctly a couple of minutes ago, there is the possibility of expansion of this disease through fluid milk. Am I correct?

The WITNESS: Yes, it could be spread through fluid milk.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: It could be spread through fluid milk and just think of that in a little compact valley like the Fraser Valley. We do not farm there as you farm in the prairie provinces, or as you farm in Quebec or Ontario; we farm as they do in the state of Wisconsin where, as some of you know, one barn is 50 feet or 100 feet from the next barn. You do not have to have cattle jumping the fences, they are rubbing noses over the fence—and the farmer's son may be visiting the daughter on the next farm that night—not over the fence but through the gate.

We are in that position in the Fraser Valley and those are the people I was sent here to represent.

I am not satisfied that the proper precautions have as yet been taken, Mr. Chairman—although I am not going to worry about spilled milk. When I hear that the virus must be frozen, according to the regulations of the department, then I cannot see that there is not danger from frozen meat—let alone what I know from the records I have.

I would like to get a copy of the rest of it. I think the most important legislation coming before this House at this session—if we do not have a war—is this very legislation before this parliament. I would like to have a copy of everything that John Diefenbaker has got or Mr. Coldwell or that anybody has got. I am entitled to it. I am entitled to everything that is on the record here.

I feel very keenly about this, Mr. Chairman, and I think I have been very good for Cruickshank in not taking up too much time; but, when you represent 90 per cent of the dairymen of the province of British Columbia and a great percentage of the beef producers of the province of British Columbia, you have reason to take time for an explanation of some of the statements that have been made, and to ask for further explanations.

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The question was asked at the beginning when this document was produced: What was it? Was it new?

I do not think anyone will find there is anything new beyond the fact that it does give a record down to April 19th. It is a record of what is in the other return but it is just a summary so it is not a matter of putting anything new on the table. It is really putting it in a form where members of the committee can get information much more easily than by mulling through all this.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Would you not have that distributed?

Right. Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I was going to say that if we were to distribute it, would it be all right to distribute it with numbers instead of names and then you can check with the other return in order to find what you want?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Pardon me. I want to explain that I agree with that. As Mr. Diefenbaker will remember I brought it up on the floor of the House that names should not be mentioned but I do want to know what frozen beef or livestock has been distributed—to who or whom, whichever is the correct English, in the province of British Columbia, I am going to insist on that.

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment please. I would like to ask if the committee is agreed that the names be referred to through the letters "A", "B", "C", and so on.

Mr. QUELCH: It is the point I would like to speak on. We have already placed on the record the names of several breeders—Mr. Waas, Mr. Haun, Mr. Hanley—and it seems to me those men would have good reason to complain if we placed their names in the record and not the others. I do not see how you should differentiate between one breeder and another. I think you should put them all in otherwise you will be discriminating against some.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): The more publicity you give this thing the greater the beating you are giving the cattle men of western Canada. They are losing \$1 million a day every time this committee puts forward any inflammatory or sensational charges with respect to the spread of the disease. It is very unwise to indulge in widespread publicity—and another thing is that this is political. I think that it is very unfair, and I would like to call your attention to this fact, Mr. Chairman, that the actual situation is that everything that we are doing here is discrediting our cattle breeders and I represent a lot of them in the constituency of Cariboo. The plain fact is that we are merely helping the United States of America in regard to their present political campaign of keeping cattle out of the American market. Don't make any mistake about that.

Mr. QUELCH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think anything that we do at this stage is going to hurt it very much more. As I see it, we want to do all we can to prevent the further spread of this disease, and I do not see how we will do that by leaving out any essential information. However, I do think that we should leave in the names that have already been referred to by the minister in the House.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might make another suggestion. We are all here now making speeches about ourselves and about our ridings, about the people we represent. And now, we are all interested in this situation and we have every interest in having the facts brought out honestly. Let us hear the evidence before we pass any judgment on it, before we attempt to decide whether it is a good thing or a bad thing. I for one want to hear the whole of the evidence before passing judgment on this thing.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What you are really doing is making a legal speech.

Mr. STEWART: No, Mr. Cruickshank, it is not a legal speech at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that all the names be stricken from these records?

Mr. QUELCH: Right from the start.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, the only difficulty in connection with these names is that a considerable number of these people's names have already been given very wide publicity. The minister himself in his speech referred to Mr. Waas, and I don't know how many others. It appears to me that it is not practical to strike these names out now. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Quelch, especially in view of the fact that half a dozen of these names have already been used, the name of Waas in particular, that perhaps the best thing to do would be to have them all in.

Mr. Ross: I can't agree personally with all this secrecy desired by the members on the committee who have spoken, nor with what many of the members have said about the constituencies they represent. Also, there has been considerable publicity. I have to take issue with the statement the minister made this morning that he thought he was protecting people who are in business. I think there has been far too much secrecy on the whole matter. For instance,

it has been observed that the second, the last outbreak, in Saskatchewan came from bones and offal from a quarter of beef which was thrown out after it had thawed out. I think these people the minister told us about have sufficient knowledge of what might happen, and if more publicity had been given to the matter it might have been prevented. I do not see the need for all this secrecy and so on. It is a matter which certainly is unfortunate for the cattle breeders of this country and the economic situation, but I do not think that we are helping it any at this stage after all the publicity there has been. All this thing has been reported. We have the members right now reading it there, and it is going to be very hard to keep it from being made public. Speaking for myself, I think there cannot be too much publicity about the whole thing. Coupled with that is the fact there has been too much secrecy in the handling of this thing right from the very start, and dealing with the economic loss involved. There are a lot of questions I would like to ask at a later time, but I must say in all seriousness that I disagree with the statement made by the minister this morning about all this secrecy. I think that the more publicity and the more educational program which can be put out about the possibility of getting Canada free of the disease, the better. I can't see the point of everybody going around trying to keep this covered up and that sort of thing. As I see it, the more publicity we are able to give to every aspect of the matter the better service we will be rendering to Canada in preventing the spread of this disease beyond what has already happened. Mr. Chairman, I agree generally with the statement made by Mr. Quelch and supported by many other, but I would call your attention to the fact that the minister has already identified a good many of the people concerned and has already given their names to the press and they have been spread all across Canada; also, I believe that a number of these people have been heard over the air on the radio. However, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing to which I want to take exception, and that is the statement by the member for Cariboo a moment ago as to this building up a case in the political campaign across the border in the United States against our market there. I do not think that was correct.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): I think the statement I made was perfectly justified and perfectly correct. One of the big issues in the United States election is that Canadian cattle ought to be kept off the American market.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Mr. Fair has the floor.

Mr. FAIR: I believe that we should find out everything that we can about the steps that are being taken to eradicate the disease and what action is being taken to look after the people concerned.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, the document I have in my hand was tabled in the House and is a public document. All the names mentioned by Dr. Childs are in this document. It has already been tabled and is already a public document. I do not know whether it is the intention of the committee to have this document printed and included in the proceedings of the committee or not; but whether it is printed in the proceedings of the committee or not, it is already a public document and already has every name in it that Dr. Childs has mentioned.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That will only add about half a dozen names to those which have already been mentioned in the evidence, and I want to remind the committee of what I said this morning; namely, that when I started to read the names in the House I was stopped. I was reading at the request of members, on the second day; and, as I say, we were asked for this information and when I started to read off the names I was asked not to. Now, about a half a dozen of these names are the names of people who went on the air over the radio and in that way gave publicity to the affair as much as anybody else. Respecting all these men you are speaking of, their names

are familiar all across the country. They have been on the air. I have heard them on the radio myself; and their names went into the press, they gave the press whatever they wanted to say. That is all right. I do not see any objection to that at all. In connection with the question raised here: are we justified in using the names? Take the case of the veterinarian who did the best he could and gave advice to a farmer and it turned out later that his advice was not correct; is it just fair to have him tabbed as having done that? I think that would be most unfortunate. I am not going to object to it, but I do think the idea should be placed before the committee and left with the chair whether it is fair to do that or whether it is not. It is quite true that everything that is in the memorandum is also in here and it can be searched out; but I am quite sure that most of the members will not read all this bulky material. A lot of them would read a memorandum, but they would not read that file. That is probably true of the public too; they would not read a big document like this; but if you make a memorandum of it and print all the names and important facts and set them out in that way they would read that; and, if the committee think that should be done, I am not going to object.

Mr. STEWART: Has this been tabled in the House?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Yes.

Mr. STEWART: Then, there is just one other point—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It will be tabled in the House by tomorrow if it has not been done yet.

Mr. STEWART: I understand it has not been tabled yet; is that what we are to understand?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The list with the names on to which reference was not on what was tabled yesterday, but this morning I undertook to see that this would be tabled; now it will be tabled tomorrow, if not this evening, and it will be available in that way, as has been stated.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that changes the picture.

Mr. JUTRAS: Just a minute now—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Argue has the floor.

Mr. ARGUE: Personally I have no strong feeling one way or the other, as I said, as to whether or not the farmer's names appear on the record. I do not think it is important, they are already public, as I understand it—most of them at any rate; and they will be made public when the public accounts come out for this year, because they will receive money from the federal treasury and those names will be in the public accounts. But I disagree with the minister in his suggestion that the names of the veterinarians and visits that they have made should also be expunged from the minister.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Not the visits, I am not saying that.

Mr. ARGUE: The details of who did the visiting; who gave advice. I think that is the very information that this committee must have. Somebody made a real mess in Saskatchewan.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I think that I must have been misunderstood. I am not asking that the names of any of the officials in this department be kept off the record, but you will notice that in that memorandum there are two or three private practitioners who were called in and gave advice.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Their names have already been mentioned in *Hansard*. Isn't that true?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Not the ones that I am thinking of; if they are, I have not heard of it before myself.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, I see.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There may be some doubt about it, but I do not believe they have been referred to.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, if you start taking off certain names, or a certain percentage of them, the question always arises whether you have taken off more names than should have been taken off. I think the only way we can be certain of getting all the evidence, all the factual evidence we need, is to keep all the names of all the veterinarians on the record.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on this. So far as the whole matter is concerned, does it not come down to this, as to whether these names add or take away any information in these documents. Now, it is a factual statement, nothing else. It is a chronological statement of all the events that took place from December 1st to March 7th, and it gives all the visits. Now, if we replace those names with a letter or any other symbol I do not see that it takes away any information at all from the value of the document. It is true that some of those names have received some publicity, but if we keep on referring to them indefinitely, or throughout the proceedings, they will get more publicity. I don't know that we have anything to gain by keeping these names. I cannot see any reason why we should keep on naming the names of these people in Saskatchewan on these farms unnecessarily. It appears to me that the names would not add anything to the document. And now, it is true, it is in that big document, and it will be tabled in the House; but how many of the public or the press actually go through these great big heavy documents and sought out the names. If anybody wants to get a particular name for a particular reason, he would go to the document and get the name; so that if there is by any chance any mention of such information by names being struck off it still is a source of information to go to, and you still can get the name and the information. Really, I do not see any use of keeping these names on the record.

Mr. DECORE: I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the minister agreed to have this document tabled with all the names would Mr. Diefenbaker agree not to have this tabled. All the documents are here before us, anyhow. It is to prevent those particulars going into the hands of the public; instead table just for the committee's use, this document in the committee. I am just making that suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is six o'clock. The hour for adjournment has arrived.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I thought we were going to get an answer to something.

Mr. DECORE: Could I get a reply from Mr. Diefenbaker?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I cannot see how we can interfere with the order of the House, and that is for the tabling of the documents. I would not like to go that far. As far as I am concerned I pointed out I do not mind, but if there is any question about the names I suggested they could be designated by A, B, C and D. Mr. Minister, there was one other matter before we adjourn, and that is in view of those itemized statements and very complete statements that the doctor made today, which are very helpful, could he also provide the committee at the next meeting with an itemized statement of the disposition of the beef disposed of from Burns during the period of the quarantine, which apparently amounts to about 130,000 pounds of beef that were sold and distributed during the time of the quarantine, the people to whom it went and the degree to which it has been traced with a view to preventing the spread of the disease, as mentioned by the member.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning, what is the committee's desire in connection with the next meeting? Will we meet again tonight at 8 o'clock?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No. 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. ROSS: May I ask you to consult the chairman of the Redistribution Committee, which is sitting tomorrow at 9.30.

Mr. JUTRAS: There is also a meeting of External Affairs tomorrow at 11.

The CHAIRMAN: Why not meet tonight, then?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Might I suggest this? We have a number of men sitting here and we are going to have to call more. Mr. Wells will have to come down here, as well as Dr. Christie, and so on. We are fighting this last attack out there at the moment and we would like to speed this up as much as we can.

Mr. SINNOTT: I move that we sit tonight at 8 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott is not a member of the committee.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): Then I will move that we sit tonight at 8 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Murray that we sit tonight at 8 o'clock.

Mr. SINNOTT: Since when, Mr. Chairman, am I not a member of this committee?

Mr. ARGUE: On that motion, I do not think the committee should be required to sit three times a day, six hours a day. This is an important subject. We want all the information and there is no member of this committee who can do justice to the job and know what is in all of these documents with three meetings a day. It is impossible. You can spend three weeks learning what is in here. Surely we should have a couple of hours tonight.

Mr. JUTRAS: We are not meeting tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: If we meet tonight we will not meet tomorrow.

Mr. ARGUE: I suggest we should meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the meeting.

Mr. ARGUE: There is a motion before the committee which is debatable, and I am discussing the time of the sitting of the committee, and I think members should realize this, that at the Redistribution Committee meeting yesterday morning it was discussed there and the members decided that the chairman of that committee should co-operate with you, sir, to attempt to get our meetings at different times, and, as I understand it, that is the very reason for the Redistribution Committee meeting at 9.30 tomorrow morning, just so that their work will be finished at eleven.

Mr. ROSS: I think we should meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock. It does not give these people any opportunity at all to look over these documents.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a motion, moved by Mr. Murray. All in favour of Mr. Murray's motion that we meet at 8 o'clock tonight?

The motion is carried.

Mr. ROSS: There are some people who voted who are not members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr. Sinnott voted, but I was not looking his way and do not know how he voted. Anyway, the vote was 19 to 15 in favour of the motion, so the motion is carried and we will meet tonight at 8 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Kindly come to order, gentlemen. Mr. Stewart has some questions to ask of Dr. Childs.

EVENING SITTING

Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, recalled:

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Dr. Childs, you made one trip to Saskatchewan in January and another one in February?—A. That is correct, sir.

Q. And on those trips you did interview officials of the Department of Agriculture for the government of the province of Saskatchewan?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Including the Minister of Agriculture, the deputy minister and any other men that they had working assisting your men from the department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, on those two occasions were there any suggestions made by the government or any of these representatives of the government of Saskatchewan—I mean it was stressed by the member for Assiniboia that there was harmony and co-operation between your federal department and the provincial department of the Saskatchewan government?—A. On very cordial terms.

Q. On very cordial terms. Was there any strife between you at all as to the policy to be followed in connection with the reduction of this disease?—

A. It was not mentioned at that time. I beg your pardon, the first trip there in January it was not mentioned to us.

Q. That is the foot and mouth disease was not even mentioned?—A. No, nor was vesicular stomatitis.

Q. And was there up to the time you went out there and actually put on the closure on February 19, I think it was—was there up to that time any suggestion of a course to be followed, such as sending anything down to Ottawa made to you by the provincial department, that was not followed?—A. No.

Q. There was not?—A. No, no suggestions made whatever.

Q. And you have this plant over at Hull that is capable of doing this job?—A. Yes, surely.

Q. And any provincial government that desires any such work made can have it done there as a matter of policy?—A. I presume they can.

Q. But there was no suggestion of anything of that sort while you were west in Saskatchewan?—A. No.

Q. There was perfect harmony completely between you and the provincial government of Saskatchewan in your efforts to eradicate this disease, no matter what disease it was?—A. There was no mention of that disease.

Q. Of this particular disease?—A. No.

Q. Of any disease at all?—A. No; the last request, I think, we had from the government of Saskatchewan was to see what we could do to get around and make more rapid tests for tuberculosis on the dairy herds in those small towns.

Q. And when was that?—A. Oh, last autumn.

Q. Last autumn?—A. Yes, or last summer.

Q. But in connection with this matter you say there was harmony and no suggestions made that were not followed by the department?—A. Yes, we promised to do this just as far as our available staff could go.

Q. But I am not talking about this other thing. There were no suggestions made that were not followed and there was harmony between you and the provincial department?—A. Absolutely.

Q. At all times?—A. Absolutely. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it quite clear, this matter was never discussed.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: A little louder, please, a little less confidential.

The WITNESS: This matter was never discussed on any plane with the provincial government officials. I want to make that clear. Not by myself.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. Was there a Dr. Johnson working for the provincial government? Was he in the field do you know, or not? He is a vet?—A. I understand he is a provincial veterinarian.

Q. Was he in the field at any time during December and January, that you know of?—A. That I could not say.

Q. Do you know whether this was drawn to his attention or not?—A. I could not say.

Q. You could not say, either?—A. Not for sure, no.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Mr. Chairman, may I ask my question again? As I understood it, Dr. Childs was going to answer just before six o'clock, so to refresh his memory I will just remind him of one of the questions I have. As I remember, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Childs was asked to answer this before 6 o'clock. What I am particularly interested in is one question, on page 12. My understanding was from Dr. Childs' evidence and that of the officials of the department, I believe, including the minister, that frozen meats distributed to the various provinces, let alone the livestock, the bone and the marrow or the live or raw meat, thrown out, could distribute this disease, whatever it happened to be. Now, I want to know just where—I am particularly interested in my own province—I want to know just where on January 25, in car No. CP 281701, the contents being fancy, 6,121 pounds; pork ribs, 2,800 pounds, in what part of my province were these meats distributed, and what firms were they distributed to?—A. We cannot tell you without a search of the invoice, bills of lading, or whatever. We cannot tell exactly who that was distributed to, sir. We are looking up all this, as far as we can, as to where they were distributed. I might say in this connection that our men were alerted long ago to check carefully around the vicinity where any of the shipments might have gone, to see if there was anything showing up at all in connection with the shipment of meats, as I mentioned here this morning, going to city areas. We do not think there is a great deal of danger because any garbage, that is scraps or bones collected for feeding to swine by garbage collectors, all such collectors are licensed and must cook the garbage before feeding it, so you would think if there was any disease going to appear it would appear in the swine on account of the scraps that might go into the garbage, but we have found throughout the years that licensing of garbage collectors is a good second line of defence, not only against this but against such other disease as hog cholera.

Q. To follow that question up, might I ask Dr. Childs, due to the fact that this shipment was on January 25, 1952, which was in the so-called danger period, am I to understand that Burns Company have no idea of what part of British Columbia that was distributed to?—A. Yes, they would know where it went to.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. They would know where it went to.

Q. Well, that is the question. I got that information exactly where it was distributed, to whom it was distributed, but I would like to know who it was distributed to, that amount and any other amount in January or February in British Columbia.—A. It went to the Burns plant in British Columbia.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. That particular shipment went to the Burns plant in Vancouver.

Q. Yes, but what I am getting at, I am willing to forego the names of individual farmers but I am not willing to forgo the names of individual distributors in British Columbia. I want to know through whom that was distributed; in other words, to find out where any of that was distributed in the province of British Columbia. Now, surely that record in this trying period must be available. I want to know, Mr. Chairman.—A. The record says "fancy 6,121 pounds, pork ribs 2,800 pounds." Now, we never had any hogs with a disease at Burns' plant shipped from Burns.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): Mr. Chairman, might I ask if the meat consigned to Vancouver would not be distributed up and down the coast to the various mining camps, logging camps, pulp and paper places, and probably consumed on the high seas, since that is a place for export?

The WITNESS: Possibly.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): Fraser Valley, being such a productive and self-sustaining place, would not be importing any meat.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, that was not a fair statement to make, and it can be ruled out of order, but as it happens from my friend's own district I had two wires today in this very connection, and that from my friend's own district, the beef district. What I am interested in is as to where this beef was distributed, and I want to reiterate, too, Mr. Chairman, that I received two wires today from my friend's own district.

The WITNESS: I would repeat, Mr. Cruickshank, that there was no beef that went in that car at that time and that we never had the disease in swine in the Burns plant. I would like that to go on the record.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. I will ask this question, then. What is "fancy, 6,121 pounds"?—A. Pork.

Q. Why is it, then, in the next column we have the word "pork"—and we produce some pork in the Fraser Valley, they do not in the Cariboo. Pork ribs, 2,800 pounds. Was there no beef that was sent to British Columbia in December, January or February, and if so where did it go?—A. The record does not show any beef as going and there was no disease in the swine there.

Q. In the month of January, was there any, or in February?—A. At no time.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask one or two questions, now. The first outbreak of the disease, I believe, was November 26 and it was reported to the federal department, as well as to a provincial vet, and there were other diseases from time to time after that. Did the federal officials take over, enforce the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and quarantine regulations and everything? Did the federal government assume a responsibility for these outbreaks, and apply the regulations?

Mr. DECORE: When?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Did any federal official in the knowledge of the veterinary director general ever suggest to any provincial man that the provincial department should be accepting some of that responsibility?—A. No discussion between federal and provincial officials that I am aware of.

Q. So there would be no suggestion, then, of any federal official to any provincial official that the provincial department should accept some responsibility, some control in this field?—A. No, because at that time the condition was not considered serious.

Q. The witness told us that up until February 11, in his opinion, and even at that date there was nothing too serious in the outbreak. I believe you told us that this morning. Is that correct?—A. That is correct; there was no talk of foot and mouth disease at all at that time.

Q. And whatever there was talk of was not too serious?—A. There was very little talk at all, if any.

Q. So it was not taken too serious. Could you give me approximately up until that time the number of animals that had been ill with the disease at any particular time? You read all those figures into the record, but could you give me the approximate number of cattle which had been ill with the disease up until February 11?—A. Do you wish me to read this record again?

Q. No; but what would you say it would be? In the neighbourhood of how many, 50 or 100, or 150?—A. Would you mind repeating your question, please?

Q. Up until February 11?—A. Up until February 11, yes.

Q. Approximately how many had been ill with the disease? I am not looking for a precise figure, but just a rough estimate; I mean those reported sick up until that date?—A. The figure is 469; that is not saying, however, that they were all sick; those are infected herds.

Q. You say those are cattle?—A. Yes, in the herds.

Q. 469?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Were they the ones which were destroyed?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): How many were infected?

The WITNESS: We assumed they were all infected.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): 469?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. My next question is: how many horses within that period of time were showing eruptions, vesicle eruptions, and were showing that they were suffering from stomatitis.—A. Would you mind repeating your question again, sir?

Q. How many horses were suffering from this disease within that period? How many reports did you have from your veterinaries about horses being ill with this disease?—A. We had no reports of horses being ill except the two which were indisposed for 2 or 3 days, being off their feed.

Mr. WRIGHT: They were never seen by a veterinary.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. They were not seen by a veterinary, but he did not give it as his opinion that they were suffering from stomatitis.—A. I am not so sure that they were.

Q. Could you tell me the main difference between foot and mouth disease and stomatitis as it affects cattle? If you were going to make a physical examination and arrive at a decision, how would you do it?—A. We would, of course, get a complete physical examination, and we would find that in foot and mouth disease, that is, really typical foot and mouth disease, of course, depending on the type—there are several types; there are three main types and a considerable number of sub types, but in the milder types the symptoms would be much like the ordinary vesicular condition; vesicular stomatitis, we will say; but in foot and mouth disease which is a typical case, you get a deep erosion, with red raw surfaces and considerable slobbering or salivation; and almost invariably in cattle you will get foot lesions; you will also get udder lesions, that is vesicles; also vesicles probably, if you look closer, on the escutcheon, perhaps on the external genitals, perhaps around the base of the horns, around the nostrils, and on the muzzle; and lameness will appear, although it may not be lameness of all 4 feet, but merely 1, 2, or 3 feet involved.

In vesicular stomatitis the symptoms are not so well marked; the lesions and erosions are usually smaller and not so deep, although other parts may be involved too; there is, actually, of course, stiffness; that is not to say that the foot is involved; it may mean muscular soreness, perhaps, but ordinarily the symptoms are not so pronounced in vesicular stomatitis.

Q. I see; then except in a very mild case of foot and mouth disease, when I understood you to say it is difficult to tell that disease from vesicular

stomatitis in your opinion by a physical examination or by observation, you can tell the difference between foot and mouth disease and vesicular stomatitis, and you were describing to me just now the differences in those two diseases?—A. Would you mind repeating your question again, please?

Q. I say that I understood you to say that it is difficult to tell by observation the difference between a mild case of foot and mouth disease and the vesicular stomatitis disease; but that in foot and mouth disease of a more pronounced nature, the difference can be observed.—A. Yes, yes; and I would like to make a little correction in what I said a while ago. The actual number of cattle that were seen to be sick or showing symptoms of the disease up until the 11th of February were 272 of those 469 in herds that were actually seen to have lesions; we assumed that they were infected.

Q. I have a textbook on animal diseases which was written by two professors at Cornell University; William Arthur Hagan, and Dalton William Bruner. Would you consider those people as competent to write on this disease?—A. I am not so sure whether or not they have ever seen the disease.

Q. Would you agree with what they have to say, for example on page 668 of their textbook, the second edition, which was put out in 1951?

Mr. STEWART: He has not said they are authorities yet.

Mr. ARGUE: That is right, but I was asking him if he would agree with them.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): Mr. Chairman, I do not think it would be in order to cite the introduction of the Encyclopedia Britannica or this other work; they may be very authentic and very valuable, but they are available in the library. We are here in order to get facts from the officials, men who have very important things to take care of and who must get away. I submit that we should not waste time in going over the Encyclopedia Britannica a second time.

There are lots of veterinaries right here around the table on the committee, and others.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I am endeavouring to determine how eminent our witness is; and it says at page 668 that the disease, referring to vesicular stomatitis, is a disease in horses and cattle and that it has been well described by Mohler (6); and in both of these, vesicles appear in the mouth; and that those in cattle cannot be distinguished from those of foot and mouth disease. That is a statement by two eminent authorities in the United States, that the vesicles of vesicular stomatitis in cattle cannot be distinguished from those of foot and mouth disease. Does the witness agree with that?—A. Not altogether, no.

Q. You do not agree with it?—A. Not altogether. In mild cases the foot and mouth disease, as I have said, could approximate the same appearance as a severe case of vesicular stomatitis.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Would you mind speaking louder?

The WITNESS: In any mild cases of foot and mouth disease, the lesions could approximate in appearance those of a severe case of vesicular stomatitis.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. And the disease which broke out first was a mild disease, whatever it was?—A. That is understood, yes.

Q. Is vesicular stomatitis a disease primarily of cattle or primarily of horses?—A. It affects both.

Q. The witness has already said this, but I shall ask him the question again. Is it not correct that horses more frequently suffer from vesicular stomatitis than do cattle?—A. That may be so; but it is rather hard to judge these days because there are not so many horses to examine or look at, and we do not get them together in large numbers any more.

Q. But you did have horses on a fair percentage of those farms. As I look over the records, the majority of the farms did have horses on those farms?—A. That is so.

Q. And those horses in no instances had vesicular stomatitis except perhaps those 3 that were off their feed.—A. That might be so.

Q. Then, if as I believe it to be a fact, vesicular stomatitis is a disease of horses rather than of cattle, and the fact that horses were not coming down with this disease, why did the officials not undertake the animal inoculations that are recommended by eminent veterinary authorities on this continent?

MR. LAING: Could we have records? I think there were only three farms on which horses have even received honourable mention?

MR. ARGUE: All right, all right, let us have the record. There were a lot more than that.

MR. LAING: I think only three or four farms had horses.

THE WITNESS: I think you will be able to get more complete answers on this from the men who did the work.

There are other factors enter into this. Horses are usually kept separate from cattle, and so on. The matter of spread might be much slower with horses on that account. I assume the men who did the work will be here before the committee and they will be in a better position to give you details surrounding the horses and cattle on the premises.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. According to the evidence you have already given to us this afternoon, a great many of these farms did have horses on them. That was the only question I had—and I understand the answer was yes.

I have another statement I would like to give you from the same authorities and I will ask your opinion on it. This is speaking about vesicular stomatitis as well.

“When the disease occurs in cattle only”—as in the case or the history of the disease in Saskatchewan—“special inoculations are required definitely to differentiate this disease from foot and mouth disease.”

You would say that statement was correct, would you not?—A. Repeat it, would you please?

Q. “When the disease occurs in cattle only, special inoculations are required definitely to differentiate this disease from foot and mouth disease.”—A. Yes, that is the correct procedure.

Q. If those special inoculations are necessary why was such a long time taken before the inoculations were finally made in February?—A. It was not considered that we were dealing with anything serious.

Q. It was not considered that we were dealing with anything serious? Even though the disease was taking on more serious proportions all the time? Even though eminent authorities say whenever you have a vesicular disease affecting cattle and not affecting horses there is only one way to find out if it is foot and mouth disease—and that is to undertake the proper inoculations?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think there is one reason we are in this mess today, and that is because—

MR. STEWART: We are not presenting argument here, I suppose.

MR. ARGUE: I have heard argument all afternoon. The member for Fraser Valley argued for fifteen minutes about the Fraser Valley.

MR. STEWART: I think what the committee wants is evidence.

MR. CRUICKSHANK: I am a farmer.

MR. ARGUE: It is all right, and I enjoyed what you said, Mr. Cruickshank, but I make the statement that the reason we are in this mess is because the officials did not follow—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order, order, order.

Mr. DECORE: I think if this 'witness' wants to give evidence he should take the box and we will listen to him. I do not think this is a time for an expression of opinions.

Mr. ARGUE: I have been asking questions and I have been getting certain information. That information leads me to certain conclusions.

Mr. STEWART: We do not want the conclusions of every member.

Mr. ARGUE: I know, I know—you do not want the conclusions—that is for sure. I will go on, Mr. Chairman.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Has the witness at any time since the taking over of office discussed with Dr. Mitchell of the lab the purposes of the lab, the work of the lab, the kind of thing it does, and so forth?—A. Surely. I have been frequently over the lab and discussed things with Dr. Mitchell.

Q. And the purpose of that lab I take it is to make examinations of various material that is sent in from time to time—that is one of the purposes?—A. That is one of the purposes.

Q. Is the lab in that respect, to your knowledge, used frequently?—A. Very frequently.

Q. Very frequently for various diseases? You have said to us before that the reason you sent out the telegram countermanding the order that the material should be sent to the Hull laboratory was that you were afraid of breakage in transit—that it might cause spread of the disease?—A. I said that, yes.

Q. When you sent that telegram at that time did you feel the disease had taken on more serious proportions?—A. Yes.

Q. What had made you believe that at that time?—A. Well, the message from Carlson. Of course, we have been over this before—

Mr. STEWART: Yes, we have been over it before.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. That is all right. Do you know of any publications your department has made in reference to foot and mouth disease? Have you distributed pamphlets—technical pamphlets—to various people informing them about the disease?—A. Yes, we have circulars—and something was read from those circulars today.

Mr. HARKNESS: Would you speak a little louder, I cannot hear.

The WITNESS: Yes, we have issued publications, and circulars, on foot and mouth disease.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You cannot get them in the Department of Agriculture; they do not seem to have them any more.

The WITNESS: We have them. This is one.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. What is that pamphlet?—A. That is on foot and mouth disease.

Q. What date was that published?—A. That was published in 1942.

Q. And has there been any publication since then in reference to foot and mouth disease?—A. Not in booklet form.

Q. No, and that booklet is still fairly well up to date?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Even though it is ten years old?—A. Yes.

Q. Then would you consider the suggestions in that pamphlet put out by your department as being good ones, and suggestions that could be followed and should be followed?—A. Surely.

Q. Then I would like you to turn to page 10 of your pamphlet and it says this on page 10:

The measures of control necessary are so severe that before diagnosis in a primary outbreak was accepted by the Health of Animals division, inoculation experiments would probably be carried out on hogs, calves, and horses.

Those inoculations were not carried out until some time in February?—A. Yes.

Q. On February 18th. That was a long time—the primary outbreak was November 26th?—A. Perhaps it was—that is as reported by the first owner there. It was showing at that time.

Q. The first outbreak of disease was on November 26th. Your own publication says that inoculation should be made on hogs, calves, and horses, and it was not until the 18th of February that steps were taken and those inoculations were finally made? If you will look at the next paragraph, and I do not want to read this as it is fairly long, it outlines in detail the way materials of animals infected with foot and mouth disease may be sent to a laboratory. Would you consider those specifications reasonably ample so there would not be any great danger of breakage?—A. Yes, we would consider those—

Q. And Dr. Carlson who was instructed to send those materials to Hull, I believe you said, went to a special school on foot and mouth disease?—A. No, I did not say that Carlson went to a special school.

Q. He took special training? He did have some additional training in foot and mouth disease?—A. He was to Mexico.

Q. Well, did he not attend an institute meeting, the lectures to which were dealing with foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. So that he did have the advantage—this is under date of February 13th to Dr. N. B. Christie, Post Office Building, signed Orland Hall, assistant veterinary director general: “You will recall Dr. Carlson attended a course last spring at the Animal Diseases Research Institute and therefore should be thoroughly conversant with the procedure to be followed.”

Do you agree with that?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on a point of order.

It has been said on two or three occasions that the men who did this work out in the field are going to be here—unless the committee refuses to hear them—and those are the only men who can answer these questions. Dr. Childs administers the head office here in Ottawa. He has responsibility for everything that is happening, in so far as we are responsible, from Halifax or from Newfoundland right through to Vancouver Island.

Now, he has got a lot of other things to do besides this particular job. This job was done by the staff in Regina. Those are the men who are going to be made available to this committee.

Now, it is all right to ask questions and then to turn around and say that means so and so and so and so; and to say these men never did make any tests on horses and they never did make any tests on hogs—

Mr. ARGUE: I never said they never made tests on horses.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That was suggested a moment ago. You take a pamphlet which says they should have done so and so, and then you say they did not do it.

Mr. Ross: They did not do it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It is all right to say that when they are not here, but how does Dr. Childs know whether they did it?

Mr. Ross: He should know.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There is not any more reason that he should know than that you should know sitting there reading these documents. However, we are going to have the men here who do know and that is the time to ask questions.

That is the time to ask questions and there is no need to go on asking someone who has never had anything to do with carrying out the work.

Mr. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday, when we were questioning the deputy minister, Mr. Gardiner rose and said that he was not the right man to ask questions of and that Dr. Childs would be before the committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Ask him the proper questions.

Mr. WRIGHT: And he said that we would have an opportunity to ask these particular technical questions of Dr. Childs who was the authority and who was the head of the department. Now, when we have Dr. Childs before the committee, the minister tells us that Dr. Childs is not the proper person to ask the questions of but that we have got to get Dr. Carlson or Dr. James from Regina.

I suppose that when Dr. James and Dr. Carlson come from Regina we will be told that we have to get somebody else. Dr. Childs is head of this department, and I think the questions that were being asked were quite legitimate questions. The honourable member from Assiniboia was trying to determine what care was taken, or the methods that were believed necessary, the precautions, in transferring this particular virus from Regina to Ottawa. Now, that being the case, I submit that it should be Dr. Childs, not Dr. Carlson, who gives us that evidence.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is correct, except for one thing. When I referred to the matter yesterday I was referring not only to Dr. Childs, I said that the whole group of men from the department who were sitting behind me were here to be called. These men ought to be called. Dr. Childs was the first one. He was called to outline the methods by which his branch administers these matters. These are the men who do the work and are the men who are going to give evidence. I do not think it is fair to them for this committee to take a man who is not the man who carried out the work and to question him and insist on getting answers, and then have these men coming along later on and to tell them: well, your boss said so and so; now why are you saying something different. I do not think we are going to get anywhere. I think the thing to do is to have the proper questions asked of Dr. Childs pertaining to his part of the administration, and then respecting the work in the field, have that dealt with by the men who did the work. We will have them all here.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman I would like to rise on a point of order. Why is the minister able to get up on a point of order? He is not a member of the committee. I do not see how he is able to get up and raise a point of order and then start to give us a speech in connection with how this or that ought to be brought before the committee. I think the minister is absolutely out of order in making speeches to the committee such as he has been making all day; and I would respectfully suggest that the minister do not rise on these points of order and instruct the committee on how it should proceed.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, if the Minister of Agriculture is not an ex officio member of this committee I do not know who is.

Mr. Ross: On this point of order, Mr. Chairman, yesterday certain questions were asked of the deputy minister and the Minister of Agriculture, as he is doing now, said: I do not know why you are wasting all this time with the

Deputy Minister of Agriculture; he said Dr. Childs is the head of this department and we are going to call him and he will be able to answer all these questions.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, no, not all of them.

Mr. ROSS: I am just waiting to ask my questions. All I am doing is waiting for an opportunity. The minister distinctly said yesterday that when Dr. Childs came here he would be able to answer these questions. The question the minister raises right now does not satisfy me because he is apparently referring to the fact that some other officials would be better able to give the evidence, and that we will find the reports of the field men from January 4 to February 12 on the record. I would think that if the minister had an efficient organization Dr. Childs would have these reports from the field men under his supervision; apparently he has not got them, but that is the very question the minister raised yesterday. Now that he finds that Dr. Childs cannot answer these questions he says: wait until we get the field men here. I say there is something grossly negligent in his organization of the department in that respect right there.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, in reply to my hon. friend may I say that if I cannot speak before this committee I will have to submit a request to the House tomorrow as to whether they will make me a member of the committee. I think that I should have the right to speak here; but we can settle that if it is necessary.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. ROSS: I was not finding fault with the minister speaking in this committee; I was finding fault about the position he takes.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On the question about yesterday, let us be reasonable about this. I expect we are going to call all these officials. We have these field men here and they will be called as soon as you have finished with Dr. Childs. When you are through with him these other officers, the field men, will be here and they can be called. If you call these field men then you don't lose any more time with these general questions. What I am suggesting is that you should reserve these questions for them when they are here. I am not objecting so much to the questions that the member for Assiniboia has been asking as I am to taking a pamphlet and saying: here is a publication, this is from your department, instructions to your officials to do so and so; now your officials didn't do it.

Mr. ARGUE: I am asking why they didn't do it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: How do you know that? They are here, you can find that out from them.

Mr. ARGUE: If they did not do it there is still a whole lot missing from this file.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): That is not an inquisition; this is an inquiry.

Mr. ARGUE: I have one or two questions left.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, if we are still on the point of order, I would like to have a word on it. I think there is another matter which should be considered at this stage. Yesterday practically the whole of the afternoon was taken up by one member. This afternoon practically the whole of the afternoon was taken up by another member. I think that we have reached the stage when some consideration should be given either to time allotment or some arrangement so that other members may have a chance to express themselves in this committee. We cannot continue this procedure where one member is allowed to get up at the beginning of the sitting and keep the floor for the whole of the session and nobody else has an opportunity to say anything. There are a great many of us around this table, members of this committee, who

would also like to ask questions. In fairness to everybody concerned I think we will have to consider the question of allotting time as we have done in other committees before where there is a similar general interest such as is being manifested here in this committee. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should consider either allotting time to members, or at least devising some method whereby at least a percentage of members will have an opportunity to speak on this question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order—

Mr. BLUE: Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I say anything in this committee, but I have one or two questions which I would like to direct to Dr. Childs—

Mr. ARGUE: On the point of order—

Mr. BLUE: I have the floor.

Mr. ARGUE: On the point of order: I was asking the witness a question and I gave way on a point of order. If anyone else wants to speak on the point of order I will give way, but I want the floor after that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: You are rising on the point of order?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: On the point of order, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: As far as Dr. Childs is concerned, I have tried to keep from pre-judging the matter, and in what I am now saying I do not want to appear in any way to be pre-judging the issue. I am trying to listen to the evidence; but Dr. Childs put on the record this afternoon and read from a record prepared, whether by himself or someone else, a complete recital of all these cases and what had been done; and he accepted and adopted what had been done as having been done on his behalf; otherwise, he could not have read all that. And I have just one word more to say to the minister. No one can have any objections to the minister being here, so long as he is not interfering with Dr. Childs giving his evidence. Yesterday and today on a number of occasions the minister was seen to be whispering with Dr. Childs when questions were being asked. In my view that is an important thing and is not in accordance with the rules of this committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You are not my school master. When I was going to school if I were caught whispering I got rapped over the knuckles, but not from you.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not think the minister should be whispering to Dr. Childs when he is giving his evidence.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I will whisper to anybody anytime I like, even to you.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I have felt that my questions in reference to Dr. Carlson were proper to put to Dr. Childs because of the telegram which was sent by Dr. Childs to Regina countermanding the order to send the material to Hull; and that was the thing I was referring to; and I was wondering if Dr. Carlson did have knowledge of foot and mouth disease, because he attended the Animal Disease Research Institute a year ago. That is all I wanted to know. Is that correct, do you know? If you do not know if it is correct, that is quite all right.

The WITNESS: He would be the best man we had in the west for that purpose. But even so, I had to consider what the results would be if by any chance it was foot and mouth disease and that material got loose, or got lost or broken. We knew what the hazard would be and we could not take any chances at all.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. What happened to your order countermanding Dr. Hall's telegram? Was the material sent to Hull in spite of that order?—A. The material had been collected and sent before my telegram reached Christie.

Q. Had it arrived here by that time?—A. It had not arrived here, no.

Q. And was the disease diagnosed on the basis of that material that came to the Hull laboratories?—A. I would say it was verified.

Q. And that was the first verification of the disease, the animal inoculations from all these different animals?—A. No.

Q. You had a report earlier than that that it was foot and mouth disease did you?—A. No, we did not have a report that it was foot and mouth disease.

Q. That was the first verification?—A. That was the first time that it was officially designated as foot and mouth disease, after the evidence was all in.

Q. So that the samples did not break coming here, because that sample came here we had the first official verification of the disease?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Darroch has the floor.

Mr. DARROCH: Those of us who have something to do with cattle breeding in Ontario realize that this outbreak has been the cause of a drop in the price of meat in Ontario of at least 5 cents a pound during the past winter season. I am quite sure, sir, that the publicity given this inquiry will cause the western ranchers, or the cattle producers, another 5 cents a pound on their feeders and stock cattle this fall. I am quite sure that Ontario is not going to be nearly as interested in purchasing cattle coming from this infected section. Now, I have just a few questions that I want to ask Dr. Childs. I have not had much of a chance to listen to the questions that have been asked here, but there are one or two that I would like to ask.

By Mr. Darroch:

Q. First, I would like to know how many cattle in the western area died from foot and mouth disease? I do not mean the ones that were shot. Were there any died of the disease?—A. I do not believe that there were any that died.

Q. Another question. How many died in the quarantined area prior to February 16 from foot and mouth disease?—A. I could not say that any died from foot and mouth disease.

Mr. DARROCH: That is all.

By Mr. Blue:

Q. I was going to ask Dr. Childs one question. Dr. Childs, are you satisfied with your assistants and your departmental officials who are turning out the work on your instructions?—A. Very well satisfied, sir.

Q. If this disease broke out again, would you take the same technique to examine it, or would you do anything different to what you have done?—A. Yes, as soon as I heard about it I would probably arrive there myself.

Q. What was your own personal intention when you came here?—A. To be questioned.

Q. Let me ask you a question. You came here to tell the story as a professional man of what you did?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you did not come here to correct the disease, but for that purpose you left your officials on the ground?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. You did not come here to correct the disease, you left your officials on the ground.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what are your observations since you came here—is it to correct the disease or is it for political gain, or what is it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. BLUE: I do not want to have to ask the question twice or three times or four times, and if you people would not make so much noise Dr. Childs could hear me. Do you not think that in your department you have done the best that could be done under the circumstances involved?

The WITNESS: Yes, sir, my conscience is clear.

Mr. BLUE: I thank you, sir, I think you have.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. I have a few questions I would like to ask Dr. Childs. In the James report, which was issued around January 4, the statement is made that the herds of Waas, Woods and Smith had fully recovered. Between that time and the time the herds were slaughtered were there any further outbreaks amongst the cattle in those herds?—A. Among those herds you mentioned, sir?

Q. Yes?—A. No, none reported.

Q. At the time James issued that statement I believe those cattle were suffering from vesicular stomatitis, but you now say they had foot and mouth disease.—A. They may have had both.

Q. In the event of an animal contracting foot and mouth disease, is there a real cure for it or does it remain dormant even though the animal appears to get better? Does the disease remain dormant in the animal?—A. I would not say that. It is my understanding of the disease that after a primary infection takes place, usually about the mouth parts and the tongue, possibly the tongue, the virus then penetrates the system, mingles with the body fluids and there is a reaction set up whereby antibodies are produced against that virus. It goes through the circulation and then breaks out everywhere, not everywhere but in the special parts, such as the mouth parts, hoof heads and other parts, nostrils, muzzle pad. But in foot and mouth disease antibodies are produced rather rapidly, as the course of the disease will indicate. We find that, within a few days after the vesicles break, it is sometimes difficult or impossible to find the virus in that animal except you go to the marrow bones or something like that, but antibodies produced in reaction to the infection of the virus will take care of it in the circulation, in the system generally, so the animal could recover from the disease, but that would not say that it would recover from the damage produced by the disease, such as sloughing of the hoofs, perhaps damage to the udder, sterility, blindness and such like.

Q. Would there be any danger of contamination from that animal spreading it around?—A. Yes, there would be danger.

Q. That is the reason that even though the herds were fully recovered it was considered necessary to slaughter them?—A. Yes, there would be danger in this way. The virus might be held in some part of the body. There might be some little, say, abscess all walled off, which is the systemic reaction to some irritant or other infection. There usually would be secondary infections of the lesions that are produced by the virus, scar tissue may be formed, and there usually is. Well, there are little pockets like that containing virus covered up and they remain in a dormant state but still capable of producing the disease. We could not say how long it would be till something breaks them down. That could occur, particularly around the hoofs. There are cases where there will be a partial separation of the hoof, which usually takes place at the heel, at the back, due to work of the virus, of course. Well, virus is apt to lie dormant in that tissue for up to a year. The reason for that is that it takes approximately 11 months for a hoof to go out altogether and shed.

Q. Then the term "fully recovered" should not be used?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. Then the term "fully recovered" should not in reality be used—I mean it will give a wrong impression?—A. It might be a misleading impression, sure.

Q. The other question I want to ask is of a different nature. It is a matter which has been referred to several times, but it has not been taken to the point where I want to take it. It is the question of the countermanding of the order to send the specimens from Regina to Ottawa. You gave as the reason that you did not consider it wise that these specimens should be sent because of the danger that they might be broken in the mail and the disease might be spread, but at that time you believed the disease to be vesicular stomatitis, but even then you considered it would be dangerous to send specimens?—A. Yes, following a message from Carlson indicating the disease was looking much more serious in this case, in the case of any probability of dealing with foot and mouth disease we could not be too careful. Over in the United States, where they have experienced at least nine outbreaks of foot and mouth disease in their history, they know more about it than we do from that experience, and they will not have the virus in the country at all. They will not move it around. They will not permit it in.

Q. Well, it is in the light of that that I cannot understand the order you gave, carried on page 4 (Sessional paper 169-F), dated February 29, which I will read:

Memorandum to district veterinarians:

Supplies and equipment for collecting material for laboratory examination obtained from cattle or other animals suspected of being infected with foot and mouth disease are going forward to your office from the Animal Diseases Research Institute, Hull, P.Q.

Where there is the least suspicion that foot and mouth disease may be present samples from the affected animal or animals should be immediately collected and sent forward to the A.D.R.I., Hull, P.Q., by air express or the most rapid method of transport available for laboratory examination.

Well, I should have thought by then that you knew for certain that it was foot and mouth disease that it would be even more dangerous to send the samples by air, because you had already countermanded the order as it might spread the disease had the samples been broken. Yet when you ascertained it was the foot and mouth disease you then gave the order to send samples by air.—A. Yes, once we knew the disease was established we had another problem on hand, in connection with animal inoculation in the field. To do this we would have to go well away from the affected area, secure suitable animals, bring them to some place where we could certainly isolate them and carry on the test. This takes considerable time. In the meantime, a serum has become available for making tests on this material, and we have better equipment. Then we had unbreakable tubes and so on, so in the interest of making, verifying, diagnosis as rapidly as possible and getting infected animals into the ground, we had to give way on that point. Is that satisfactory?

Q. Yes. There is just one more question. I asked the question of the deputy minister and he said it should be referred to you, and that is regarding the inspection of the animals turned out to pasture. Just what kind of inspection is made, and is the inspection today more thorough than the inspection that was the general routine practice before the disease was started?—A. Yes, sir, I can answer you that. We talked this over on the telephone, sent memorandums to our people at Regina, Dr. Christie, who is the district veterinarian in charge, and Dr. Wells, who is handling the cleaning up operations. Now, it was like this. We knew out there in the spring when the snow goes they are not going to keep their cattle in the barns, and if we do not let them go to the pastures they would be scattered around the country. So the arrangement was this—this, of course, was confirmed by circular which we can produce if you think we need it—that all cattle going to these pastures should be

thoroughly, closely, given a full and close physical examination, description, where they came from, where they went to, if they did not already carry one of our departmental ear tags they were to be tagged, so they could be identified. We think that inspection will be very thorough. And further, the larger pastures, one of our veterinarians will be watching them closely. We have taken all the precautions we can in that direction. We would, of course, have chaos if they ran loose around the country. We would not know where they are. But in this case they pass under somebody's hand, they are looked at, they are examined and identified. We know where they come from.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, for the last two days the emphasis has been placed mostly on the reports that have been made from the field to the veterinary director general. Emphasis has been almost exclusively placed on the slips of paper, if I may put it this way, that have passed from the veterinary director general to his officials. I think that a great many agree that, as it was pointed out this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture, the veterinary director general after all is in charge not only of the province of Saskatchewan but has a great many other provinces to look after. Apart from the director general, who is responsible for the ten provinces of Canada, there is a district inspector, a man who is fully qualified in each province to look after the problems as they occur in each province. I might say in passing that, in this particular instance, it just so happened that one of the men in the province of Saskatchewan was one of the 3 men in Canada who had had experience with this foot and mouth disease in Canada because he had gone down to Mexico to have an actual physical look at the disease down there; therefore, he was one of the 3 men in Canada who had seen the disease.

Mr. Ross: Are you or the witness giving evidence?

Mr. JUTRAS: No, I am just reviewing a few of the arguments that were repeatedly presented for the last 3 days leading up to my point. Apart from that, there was also a veterinary of the province, appointed by the province and paid by the province, in the field. Now, yesterday the member for Lake Centre spent most if not all of the afternoon, stressing the point that no reports had been made to the director-general in the famous period from January 4 to February 13.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I just accepted the return which was filed.

Mr. JUTRAS: I am not disputing the statement you made, but the hon. member reviewed the facts for most of the afternoon. All I am doing is just trying to sort out what has been said in this committee since we started. I have not missed a minute of the proceedings of this committee so far, and as every other member of the committee has tried to do, I am trying to assimilate what has been said in the committee.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, has the hon. gentleman the right to review the evidence?

Mr. JUTRAS: Very well.

Mr. BROWNE: If everybody else has the same right as he has, when will we ever get through our work?

The CHAIRMAN: I think there has been a lot of reviewing. But go ahead.

Mr. WRIGHT: We are all going to be allowed to do this very thing, Mr. Chairman. So that is agreed.

Mr. JUTRAS: No, I am not trying—I do not wish to establish a precedent.

Mr. ARGUE: But you are doing it.

Mr. JUTRAS: If the hon. members of the committee wish to ration the time of the committee, I would be quite agreeable to do it that way and confine myself to the specific amount of time that I was allowed; but I have

just pointed out that one member took up the full meeting, all the afternoon yesterday all by himself. I had some questions to ask at that time but I never got a chance to ask them. And since that time many others have asked questions and now, naturally, there have been so many things asked and so many questions repeated that I am trying to review in my mind what actually happened. But if the hon. members want to ration the time of the committee, all right, I will be agreeable to it, and will keep to my 5 or 10 or 15 minutes as the case may be; but in that case there would not be any need of reviewing, because all the time would not be taken up by one member. But until a ruling is taken on that, I think I must have the same privilege as Messrs. Diefenbaker, Argue and Charlton, who took all the time this afternoon. I propose to avail myself of the same privilege that they enjoyed this afternoon and they certainly repeated a lot of things that were said in previous meetings. So, Mr. Chairman, as I said, much has been said about this period of January 4 to February 13, and the impression was carried in the press throughout the country—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Are you going to attempt to pass judgment on the press?

Mr. JUTRAS: After all, the press is a fair reflection of the opinions which are reflected in the committee; and the member who has just spoken is the one who created that impression, rightly or wrongly. Now, an impression was carried that absolutely nothing was done by the Department of Agriculture during that period from January 4 to February 13 because there were no written communications between the director-general and some of his officials in Saskatchewan.

Mr. ROSS: There is no record of any.

Mr. JUTRAS: No written record; that is why I say that too much emphasis, in my humble opinion, for whatever it is worth—in my humble opinion—too much emphasis has been placed on the slips of paper that pass from the director-general to his officials. After all, we are here to consider not so much the slips of paper as to consider the action that was taken in the field.

Mr. ROSS: As the absence of such slips of paper.

Mr. JUTRAS: As the absence of such slips of paper; but what we are concerned with here is what action was taken. And I was very pleased this afternoon when the director-general read out to the committee a chronological list of all action that had been taken in the field, and all over, during that period. As the record showed, and I took it down at the time, the first outbreak occurred on the 1st; and then there is a series of inspections, almost constant in sections, which took place in the field at that time, with the exception that between December 29, as was pointed out by the director-general, between the period of December 29 to January 23, there were no outbreaks, no cases reported to any of the departments in the province of Saskatchewan, of any new disease in the province.

Mr. BROWNE: What was the date?

Mr. JUTRAS: Between December 29 to January 23 there was a single new case reported in the province; and as a matter of fact, the last case that was reported was on December 29, that was the Clifton case on December 29; and all of the cattle on that farm responded to treatment and all recovered from the disease. So that from December 20 there were no cattle sick of the disease as far as I know and as far as the record bears out, from December 29 to January 23.

Mr. ROSS: Oh yes, there were!

Mr. BROWNE: I do not know if the hon. gentleman has read these reports, but I have them here in front of me now and I have one dated January 8, the Burns Company Limited.

Mr. JUTRAS: Just a minute, just a minute. I said "new cases".

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Now, Mr. Jutras.

Mr. JUTRAS: I think I have the floor just now.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, you may go ahead.

Mr. JUTRAS: I am talking about new cases. The Burns case was reported on December 28, the stockyards; no, not the stockyards, the feed lot.

Mr. BROWNE: The hon. gentleman was under the same impression that I was, that there was only one lot of cattle at Burns that was infected; but in fact cattle were continually coming into Burns plant and new cattle got the disease.

Mr. JUTRAS: Yes, it is assumed that the cattle which got it at the Burns plant probably got it there. I am not talking of the number of animals that got the disease, but of the new cases. There was a new case in Saskatchewan on December 1st; that was the first case, the Waas case; and the second case was the Wood case on December 12. Mr. Wood apparently caught the disease when he went to work on the Waas farm; then Mr. Smith also went to work to help Mr. MacLean, and he got an outbreak on December 14. So the December 1st, December 12, and December 14 cases are all related to the same incident. Then on December 28, there was an outbreak at the Burns feeder lot, and all were relegated together. For the moment the Burns plant naturally had ramifications which later on, on the 28th—but that I think is one case, and I am referring to other cases that took place. Then there was another case, the Clifton case on December 29, and these animals were attended to on December 29, and they responded to treatment and they were all cured. So were the animals on Mr. Smith's place and the others, they recovered from the disease. There was no further sign of disease, and there were no new cases reported in the province or in the area or anywhere until January 23.

Mr. ARGUE: From what date?

Mr. JUTRAS: December 29 was the last case reported.

Mr. ARGUE: I have the file here and on page 47 it says: "date of visit, January 5 to R. Clifton at Regina."

Mr. JUTRAS: That does not mean a thing.

Mr. ARGUE: And it says that the disease is stomatitis.

Mr. JUTRAS: Please allow me to finish.

Mr. ARGUE: I want you to give us facts instead of opinions.

Mr. JUTRAS: I say that no new case was reported after the 29th.

Mr. ARGUE: That is not right.

Mr. JUTRAS: We were told this afternoon by the director-general that the Clifton case was reported and if you will listen to me, Mr. Argue, I would like to get this straight over to you.

Mr. ARGUE: I am listening.

Mr. JUTRAS: The Clifton case was reported on December 29; then there were a series of inspections made there. The cattle were treated and on January 21, after having received treatment, the cattle were all completely recovered. I am not manufacturing this information. This is what the director-general said, Dr. Childs. The cattle were treated.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please!

Mr. JUTRAS: The cattle were treated and they responded to treatment and on January 21 the cattle were all completely recovered, so that bears me out. I am taking the facts from the statement of the director-general which were given this afternoon, that from December 29 to January 23, there was actually no reason for any report to the director-general because at least from the documents presented this afternoon, the disease seemed to be under control

and all the cattle had recovered and there were no new outbreaks. Then the next outbreak took place on the farm of Mr. Barrie, Mr. Ash Barrie, on January 23.

Mr. HARKNESS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Jutras has now been talking for 10 or 15 minutes and he has been reviewing the evidence and history of this disease which we have had so far. The minister indicated on several occasions here that there was some urgency for us to finish our cross-examination.

Mr. JUTRAS: I like that!

Mr. HARKNESS: As I said, finish our cross-examination so that these witnesses might get back to their job of fighting this disease. I think that what we should be doing is cross-examining the witnesses and not making these long speeches or going over and repeating time after time the history of the disease. We have had the history of the disease given to us and I think if Mr. Jutras wants to ask any questions, he should ask them, and end this present discourse.

Mr. JUTRAS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I have a right to speak on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. Go ahead.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Harkness has raised a point of order that I have been speaking 10 or 12 minutes. I like the nerve of the hon. member to raise that point of order because I spoke for 12 minutes.

Mr. ROSS: But without a question.

Mr. JUTRAS: When Mr. Diefenbaker and Mr. Argue and Mr. Charlton took 3½ hours, or the whole afternoon.

Mr. ROSS: But you have not asked one question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please!

Mr. ARGUE: I was not on at all after 11:30 this morning.

Mr. STEWART: I think the member who is just speaking is possibly only to a slight extent repeating the offences of the previous speakers. They admitted they did review and were repeating constantly. A member of the last party admitted that he had and was repeating 2 or 3 times. So I would suggest to the chairman that we get on with this meeting and that the chairman rule that we do not repeat previous arguments and that we limit our time to reasonably new material. Mr. Jutras is simply following a very long precedent set by the previous veterinary surgeon here, and recapitulating and admitting that he is recapitulating and repeating previous things that we have all heard 2 or 3 times. I think the chairman should rule that we are not here to review each and every speech by repeating it, but that we are here to find out what caused this trouble and what the remedy is, so that we can get somewhere with this committee.

Mr. ROSS: On a point of order. I do not like raising any objection and I am very interested in following the hon. member, but every word he has said in his twelve or fifteen minutes will be found in the record today and he has not asked one question.

Mr. JUTRAS: Why do you raise an objection to what I have been saying?

Mr. ROSS: I have not any objection to any member getting up and prefacing a question with some statement of fact, but every word is to be found in the record of the statements by the witness today. He has taken all this time reviewing, and he is certainly going to cause us a lot of unnecessary waste of time. I would think you would have to have some more order.

The CHAIRMAN: I think there has been a lot of reviewing since this committee sat first but possibly at a subsequent meeting we might limit the reviewing. Go ahead, Mr. Jutras.

Mr. JUTRAS: I do not wish to repeat any argument that was made, but if statements have been made repeatedly it is not my fault. I cannot take responsibility for them, and if a false impression has been created by these statements being repeatedly made in this committee that also is not my responsibility. It is my responsibility, I think, as a responsible member of this committee to give my interpretation of it and, as I pointed out earlier, the statement was made repeatedly that there were eleven outbreaks of the disease during the month of January and that no reports whatsoever were made on them.

Mr. CHARLTON: That was the evidence of Dr. Childs himself.

Mr. JUTRAS: Well, just a moment. I am not taking anything away from the statement I made. It was repeatedly stated that eleven cases occurred during the month of January and that no reports were made to the director general.

Now, I am trying to complete that because I do not think it is giving a fair impression of what actually took place at that time.

It is all right to say that eleven cases occurred during January, but if the eleven cases happened on the last day of January that is an entirely different picture from what it would be if they occurred every third day during the month of January. That is the only point I am trying to establish.

This afternoon a record was given which would indicate that there were no cases, not one single case, which occurred from the beginning to the 23rd—

Mr. ROSS: No new cases.

Mr. JUTRAS: No new case occurred. The first new case to occur in that month was on the 23rd.

Mr. BROWNE: You mean the new outbreak?

Mr. JUTRAS: Yes. It gives a different picture from the impression that is created when you say there were eleven cases that occurred during that month—without saying when they occurred during the month. I am not trying to build up a case one way or another. I am trying to get at the facts—the exact facts—and those are the facts as they are given.

Mr. ROSS: They are all in the record.

Mr. JUTRAS: There were no cases up until the 23rd and then we were given all the actions that were taken at that time.

Now, there is another point. I am not a veterinarian as others on the committee are. I do not know very much about this foot and mouth disease.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. JUTRAS: We have a veterinarian, Mr. Charlton, as a member of this committee, Mr. Charlton created great ado over the fact that Dr. Childs countermanded the order to have a sample sent to Ottawa for inspection. As I say, I do not know anything about it but I am trying to make up my mind.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order again. Was that order of yours made with regard to procedure for this meeting?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I said it might possibly be adopted at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. WRIGHT: It was just a hope.

Mr. ROSS: A pious hope.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, then I object to a certain ruling being applied in this committee for this meeting and then saying that at the next meeting we are going to have a different set of rules to go by. That in fact is what you are saying—that in so far as this meeting is concerned members are permitted to make statements but at the next meeting you hope we will have a different set of rules.

Mr. JUTRAS: I object to that statement too on the grounds that since others had that privilege for the last two days I do not see why I should be denied the privilege tonight.

Mr. ROSS: If you will not rule, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an appeal to the hon. member that we are wasting a lot of the time of these officials. We can read the record and find every word that the member has uttered in the last twenty or twenty-five minutes. I would hope after this objection that he would ask questions of the officials and then let some of the rest of us ask questions.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I think I am in order and I will make a motion. I understand there is a very interesting debate in the House of Commons and I want to move a motion which is not debatable. I move that we adjourn until tomorrow.

Mr. BRYCE: I came here to this committee to ask questions and I have sat here the whole blessed day and I have not had a chance to ask my questions yet.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed—

The CHAIRMAN: The motion to adjourn is not debatable. You have heard Mr. Cruickshank's motion—all in favour? Contrary?

I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Jutras, would you try to be brief?

Mr. JUTRAS: I will try to be as brief as I can and I will not be very long.

As I say, and I am very serious on this, we have had so many versions that it is difficult for the ordinary layman to make up his mind.

Mr. QUELCH: Why do you not then ask some questions?

Mr. JUTRAS: That is what I am going to do if you will just give me a chance and stop interrupting me.

This afternoon, as I said, objections were raised particularly by Mr. Charlton to the telegram of Dr. Childs countermanding the order that the diagnosis should be done in Hull. I find that in the record of the House, March 3rd at page 47, Mr. Charlton had this to say:

It has been said that Dr. Childs went out there on the 17th of January. Here are the instructions given to veterinarians across the Dominion of Canada with respect to foot and mouth disease.

I will dispense with the regulation.

I should like to repeat the first point:

"Any vesicular disease of any animal may be dangerous."

Then he goes on:

This letter was sent out to all veterinarians over the signature of Dr. Childs, veterinary director general, who went out there himself on the 17th of January. If what he says as to the danger is so, why were tests not made in the field? I understand that is possible although the minister said today it is not possible to diagnose the disease without serum.

I want to contradict the minister on that point because the serum is not required for a diagnosis of this disease.

That is exactly what Dr. Childs wired them to do in Regina—yet Mr. Charlton this afternoon took very great exception to it.

Now, what is his opinion? Is it what he said this afternoon, or what he said in the House?

Mr. CHARLTON: I am not on the stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bryce.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Dr. Childs, I have been around stockyards a long time but I want this to be cleared up. What does "fancy" mean. Does it mean the heart, liver and so on of a pig? My friend from British Columbia got some fancy stuff in there but I do not think he knows any more than I do about what it is.—A. It is some time since I was around the packing plants, although I started my career in the department in the packing plant. They may have changed their terminology a bit since but certain plants use the term "fancy meat" to cover various parts such as hearts, livers, and so on.

Q. Would you be safe enough to say it is the by-products of the hog?

A. Where you have the term "fancy" yes, I think it would be. They might of course use the term to describe something superlative, good.

Q. The serum that you use to diagnose samples you get from the old country? Do you produce it in your laboratory at Hull or do you import it from some place?—A. That serum was brought from Kirkcubright in Scotland. Kirkcubright is really the foot and mouth disease research centre of the world. The people there, their equipment and technical facilities are considered to be tops.

Q. They do not have it in the United States?—A. No.

Q. Do you keep a supply in your laboratory here at all times or when you have an outbreak is it necessary for you to send to Britain for it?—A. As far as I understand Dr. Mitchell had no supply of this serum until it was considered that we had something serious out here.

Q. Then when this outbreak occurred you had to send for it?—A. Yes. It was flown over—we cabled for it and it was flown over.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. On the matter of prevention, when was the last outbreak in the United States, Dr. Childs?—A. I believe in 1929.

Q. In 1929, and much ado was made in the press about locating this German immigrant, and the matter of bringing this disease by immigration. I believe you had occasion to go into the matter of the protection which the United States has put on in the last few years. Is there any protection on the matter of immigration—immigrant's clothes and effects?—A. No.

Q. You made inquiries in writing?—A. Yes.

Q. There is no such prevention in regard to immigration in the United States?—A. Unless they have put it on in the last couple of weeks. I knew already that they did not bother with immigrants' clothing and effects in the United States—immigrants from any country—but to make sure of that I wrote to the chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry in Washington to get it in writing. The answer was that they did not do so but in view of our experience in Canada they might re-examine the subject.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ross?

By Mr. Ross:

Q. I would like to ask Dr. Childs a question particularly on this point; I understand the second last outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan was the result of the sale of a quarter of frozen beef where the bone and some of the quarter had been thrown out in the yard, and not properly disposed of, and that was the cause of this particular infection. Can you say where that quarter of beef came from.—A. It was traced to a local store.

Q. To a local store?—A. Yes; and it was purchased by that party from, I believe, Burns.

Q. From the Burns' packing plant?—A. I believe so.

Q. And during the winter it was kept in a frozen state?—A. It was kept in a frozen state.

Q. And it originated from the Burns' packing plant in Regina?—A. Yes, as far as we know it did.

Q. Can you say what date it left the Burns' plant?—A. I am not sure on that.

Q. But you are satisfied from your investigation that is what caused it?—A. That is the report. It is subject to revision though if there is anything else that comes up.

Q. Yes. Well, Dr. Childs, I read last summer an account in the newspaper where your assistant, Dr. Hall, had given an interview, or appeared at a meeting and gave an address about foot and mouth disease. You recollect that, do you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Therefore I should think your officials ought to be very alert to the danger of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Canada, they were all alert to that?—A. Yes.

Q. I also read in your report, under date of March 31, 1950, where you had reported to the director of production services something dealing with the danger of foot and mouth disease being introduced in Canada in countries where this disease remained extant, was always present, and that the danger had been enhanced on account of the fact that in recent years the facility, the rapidity with which transportation could be effected caused it to become a much greater danger? That is true, isn't it?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, in view of those facts, your department officials were always on the outlook for the possibility of an outbreak affecting Canada. In view of the evidence given here so far, it is very difficult to imagine why some reports from the field officers were not on record from these dates, between January 4 and February 12th, and then after we knew of the new outbreak. I would think from a study of this that your officials would have been alerted to the similarity, if this did happen to be foot and mouth disease. There were quite a few cases between November and December, and you had the report from Dr. James on December 28th of the Burns' outbreak and the federal quarantine which followed. It is very strange to me that there were not a series of reports on file about that situation. How do you reconcile that, in view of what has been said?—A. There was nothing to report during that period.

Q. Pardon me?—A. There was nothing to report during that period.

Q. There was nothing to report?—A. If there had been any case it would have been reported.

Q. And would not that cause a quarantine to be put into effect?—A. Surely.

Q. There is another question in which I am interested, and it relates to some questions of law which have been raised here, both provincial law and federal law. You should be able to tell me, I think, if it is recognized that your department has the authority; that is, the Federal Health of Animals branch, that they are responsible for diseases of animals within Canada.—A. That is correct.

Q. Pardon me?—A. That is correct—not all diseases.

Mr. STEWART: That is a legal question, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: I am not a legal man, I am only a layman, but I am trying to get the matter clear in my mind.

Mr. STEWART: But you are a legislator.

Mr. ROSS: I am a very humble layman, and my questions are the questions of a layman. I am merely trying to find out who is responsible, just for my own information. I want to get clear exactly what the position of the federal department is.

The WITNESS: Would you mind repeating that?

Mr. STEWART: He is not a lawyer either.

Mr. ROSS: Yes, I appreciate that. That may be so, but I am only a layman while he is the head of a branch.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. My point is this: as a question of law the Health of Animals branch, or your branch of the Department of Agriculture, as I understand it, is chiefly responsible for contagious diseases? Your health of animal work covers the whole of the Dominion of Canada—I should not say dominion at this stage—A. That is right. We accept responsibility for the prevention, control and eradication of certain diseases which we call reportable diseases. We have the right in law, certainly of using our authority for purposes of quarantine, for purposes of control in any place where we may suspect a serious disease to be; it is not necessary for it to be there, but if we suspect it, we will try to pull a curtain around it to make sure.

Q. You say that is your responsibility?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Catherwood:

Q. I would like to ask Dr. Childs a question. I believe Dr. Childs said this afternoon that certain specimens had been sent to the laboratory in Hull. I think that is true?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And later on he referred to Dr. James having forwarded these samples, and to their having been sent by express, but that he had objected to the samples being forwarded. I wonder if he would care to tell us on what ground he based his objection?—A. I did that just a little while ago, but apparently I was not able to make the point. I did that a while ago. Conditions change very fast at times like this. Naturally, we find that the first specimens got through all right with nothing broken, they got through safely. We found that we were having numerous reports—we have a very excellent reporting service throughout Canada which was set up quite some time ago to report these things to us. These reports sometimes are not understood, and yet they take a lot of time and involve a lot of work. And now, we have a weekly report service from what we call sub-districts all over Canada and there are veterinaries posted at headquarters at certain points over the country, like at Peterboro, Stratford, Kingston, London and so on, throughout the country; and we had a committee set up to act as a center, and the people are briefed on certain diseases or conditions that they should report in. That is just in case of emergency, so we can get on to these things quite quickly and quarantine and control them before they get out of hand, as was the case out there. Well, this meant a lot of work for us and the result is that as soon as word got around that we had foot and mouth disease; and that was, as you know, shouted to the skies in all directions, and we were getting numerous reports that there were outbreaks of foot and mouth disease some place, and we would have to go out and investigate and if there is a shadow of doubt that it might be that we had to do something about it to verify it. We found that it was impossible in all of these cases to secure analysts, just analysts from outside, and we could not even collect the specimens needed for the purpose. Nobody ever gives us anything, they don't give those things away, we have to buy that; and then we have to make the tests. We felt that it was just impossible so, when we had the serums here we were very careful how we kept it, what we did with it, on account of danger if it became broken or lost. There was always that danger, and that was the reason why we changed our method of dealing with it.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. How long did it take you to make the tests after you received the serum?—A. Do you mean animal or seriological?

Q. The seriological test.—A. Where we make the animal test we would not probably—I do not think that Dr. Mitchell could make a pronouncement on it for 5 days. I may be wrong there, but there are certain methods of making animal inoculations where you could get indications of the disease perhaps within 48 hours, but not always.

Q. I understand there has been a recent outbreak at Weyburn in the last 24 hours. Have you had any information as to how serious the outbreak might be?—A. We were still taking the evidence.

Mr. STEWART: Dr. Childs, in connection with this—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacKenzie has the floor.

Mr. STEWART: Are we to adjourn at 10 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I was just going to let Mr. MacKenzie ask his questions.

Mr. STEWART: In connection with these provincial statutes I recited, you did not in any way attempt to countermand these statutes and say to the Government of Saskatchewan or the minister: you are not to operate under those statutes.

The WITNESS: Heavens no, no.

By Mr. MacKenzie:

Q. Mr. Chairman, my questions are very simple. As a matter of fact, one of them has already been answered and it would be repetition. It was this: How long after an animal is inoculated are you able to get verification, in what length of time does it become manifest? You have already answered that pretty well. My second question is this: evidently in all the outbreaks there have been no animals which have died as a result of the disease and they have apparently made a normal recovery. If they did make a normal recovery, supposing there were outbreaks that were not reported and the animal had made an apparently complete recovery and then these animals had been turned out to a community pasture, would they become carriers, say like typhoid and malaria carriers and spread it abroad?—A. Yes sir, they possibly could; but we have a method of offsetting that, and that is one thing in connection with which we need the services of a lot of men. Now, to follow that up and to eliminate dangers like that we set up a farm inspection service for the inspection of suspected animals. One of our field men can go to these farms and check these animals over and question the farmer, and if there is any evidence of any sickness having been around the place he will go and take a look at these animals to see if they have been affected. That can be detected by scars that are left, do you see.

Q. It is quite an undertaking?—A. It is a big undertaking, there is no doubt about that.

Q. And you have made that inspection before they are turned out, naturally.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Did you do that in the buffer zone or in the quarantine zone only?—A. In the buffer zone, and beyond the buffer zone too. Knowing the attitude of the United States, knowing them very well and their feeling towards this disease and their great fear of getting it into that country, and to reassure them, our men have been carrying on inspection along the borderline of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Susceptible animals along the border areas have been checked, at least on the first one or two rows of townships north, and sometimes more, but we give our first attention to the farm-to-farm inspection.

in the danger zone, which is a closely quarantined area, and next the buffer zone around that. I may say here, in Britain where it is popping up every day, pretty well out of hand—I am afraid it has appeared in Scotland, too, in Aberdeenshire in the last few days, for the first time last summer—but over there after they have a quarantine on, when there is an outbreak on some farm, they issue what is called a standstill order covering an area of 15 miles around that place. That means there is to be no movement of stock, no sales and so on. After a period of 15 days they begin to contract, as they say, the area, bring it in. We have not dared to do that, not yet.

Mr. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I move the adjournment.

The meeting adjourned.

loc
HD
1781
A38
1952
No 3

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

No. 3

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1952

WITNESSES:

Mr. J. G. Taggart, C.B.E., Deputy Minister, and Dr. Thomas Childs,
Veterinary Director General, Department of Agriculture.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1952



MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, May 2, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 4 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Darroch, Decore, Diefenbaker, Dumas, Fair, Gardiner, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kickham, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, Major, Masse, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Mr. J. G. Taggart, C.B.E., Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

The Chairman presented the First Report of the Sub-Committee on Agenda and Procedure, which is as follows:

Your Sub-Committee on Agenda and Procedure met on Thursday, May 1, and agreed to recommend:

1. That the next meeting of the Committee be called for Friday, May 2, at 4 o'clock p.m., that examination of Dr. Childs be continued and, if concluded, that Dr. G. A. Rose, Chief Veterinarian, Meat Inspection, be called.

2. That arrangements be made to hear the following witnesses during the week commencing May 5:

Monday, May 5: Drs. E. E. Carlson and N. V. James, Regina.

Tuesday, May 6, and

Wednesday, May 7: Dr. C. A. Mitchell, Chief Division of Animal Pathology; Dr. O. Hall, Asst. Veterinary Director General, and other officials stationed in Ottawa.

Thursday, May 8: Dr. K. F. Wells, Regina.

3. That ten minutes be the maximum time allowed any one member for one series of questions.

The Chairman also read the following memorandum and suggested that the recommendations of the Sub-Committee relating to the Agenda for the week of May 5, be amended accordingly:

Memorandum for Mr. A. Bater, Chairman, Agricultural and Colonization Committee

Dr. Hall has not returned to the city and it will therefore not be possible to call him before the committee today.

Dr. Taggart is available to give evidence regarding the shipment of cattle to Montreal, and then Dr. Childs could return to continue his evidence.

Dr. Hall will be available on Monday and could be called. Dr. Mitchell will be in the city on Monday and will be available to appear.

Arrangements are being made to have Drs. Carlson and James flown to Ottawa from Regina and they will be available to appear on Tuesday.

It will be necessary for Dr. Carlson to return to Regina on Tuesday night to take charge in order that Dr. Wells can come to Ottawa. Dr. Wells can be available to appear on Thursday.

The procedure would therefore be as follows:

Friday, May 2nd—Dr. J. G. Taggart, Dr. T. Childs.

Monday, May 5th—Dr. O. Hall, Dr. C. A. Mitchell.

Tuesday, May 6th—Dr. E. E. Carlson, Dr. N. V. James.

Thursday, May 8th—Dr. K. F. Wells.

On motion of Mr. Laing, the First Report of the Sub-Committee, as amended, was adopted.

Mr. Taggart was recalled, questioned and retired.

On motion of Mr. Sinnott, at 6 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 8 o'clock p.m. this day.

EVENING

At 8 o'clock p.m. the Committee resumed, the Chairman Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Darroch, Decore, Dumas, Fair, Gardiner, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kickham, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, Masse, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, Whitman, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, Department of Agriculture.

Examination of Dr. Childs was resumed.

On motion of Mr. Wylie, at 10.12 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until Monday, May 5, at 11 o'clock a.m.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

May 2, 1952.

4.00 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Come to order, please. At the outset of the meeting this afternoon I wish to welcome two new members to this committee, the Right Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Mr. Sinnott. First of all, gentlemen, I will read you the first report of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. We had a meeting at the conclusion of last night's meeting.

(Report read).

Now, in connection with these dates, just as I went into the House I received this memorandum. I will read it.

I would like now to have a motion of concurrence in our report of the meeting of last night, with the amendment I have just read stating that some of these officials are not able to be present on certain days. Moved by Mr. Laing. All in favour of the motion?

Mr. WRIGHT: Is that a motion for concurrence with the recommendations of the report of the steering committee as to the time limit?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I am calling this an amendment to the report, which I just read.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to say a word on that. There is just one recommendation that I would like to add to it, that you, sir, as chairman, do not see anyone you have already seen until any other member of the committee who has not had an opportunity to ask questions for 10 minutes, or whatever period he likes, has had an opportunity. I do not think it is fair that one man should use 10 minutes and someone else come in and then the same man go on again for another 10 minutes. I think at least everyone on the committee who wishes to ask a question should have the opportunity before a second round is started. If I might add that to your recommendations, I would certainly be in favour.

Mr. LAING: I think that that point is covered by the phrase "one series of questions".

The CHAIRMAN: I think that covers it: "that 10 minutes be the maximum time allowed any one member for one series of questions."

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, but you might see him again.

The CHAIRMAN: You have all heard Mr. Laing's motion.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Does that also go for one series of legal expositions or political talks, or anything?

Mr. DECORE: About the Fraser Valley, too?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Never mind the Fraser Valley.

The CHAIRMAN: All in favour of Mr. Laing's motion?

Agreed. Carried.

Mr. DYEENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, there is a question I would like to be informed on this afternoon, about which I spoke to the minister a moment ago. This is a matter that should be clarified, and I think the minister would be prepared to give a statement at the moment regarding the latest outbreak at Weyburn, and whether or not recent outbreaks, either at Ormiston or Weyburn, would be normal and would be expected.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I had intended this afternoon in the House to have made a statement on the situation as it exists at Weyburn, but there were so many other things coming up that it got by. My reason for that is that some of the reports which have gone out from our own office and elsewhere have perhaps over-emphasized the difficulties there, and I think it would be well to have the facts put out, and if there is anything which I do not give now I hope Mr. Taggart will give it before he proceeds with the other exposition that he is going to give. In a telephone conversation between Dr. Christie and Dr. James at 11.30 a.m. today, Ottawa time, which would be 9.30 Regina time, we were advised that no new cases were discovered in the Weyburn area. Now, that means that there is only one case of the disease in the Weyburn area. There never has been any more than that. There were two contacts and I think perhaps someone is confusing contacts with cases; that is, two farmers whose cattle came up and ate grass on the same pasture where the other cattle were. Now, those cattle are, naturally, being destroyed. But there are not any new cases there, just simply contacts. There has only been the one case, and the contacts, and there is, too, a further fact that has been spread across the country now, that there may be cattle out of this one herd where there actually were cases that had been put into the community pasture prior to the outbreak of the disease, but from that man's farm, fortunately, I think there were 24 cattle put in the pasture. There were some 900-odd in the pasture. Fortunately, there has been no outbreak whatsoever in the pasture. These cattle were segregated immediately. We knew of the disease on the farmer's place, and they have been kept segregated and under inspection all the time by veterinarians, and there has been no outbreak either in the 24 or among the 900 in the pasture, or until now, and there is no reason for feeling that we may have to destroy all the cattle in that pasture, excepting the risk that some of those cattle may yet develop the disease, but every day that goes by makes it more and more certain that will not happen. Up till now we have only one case in the Weyburn area.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: When was that?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Last Monday I announced it in the House. There has been no further outbreak around that area since, and we have destroyed some cattle of other farmers because it has been learned they had been pastured in the farmer's lot.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: How many were destroyed altogether?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: 121, the last figure.

Mr. WRIGHT: How many days previous to the outbreak in this herd were the cattle taken from it and placed in the pasture?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Eight days.

Mr. ARGUE: Is there any evidence as to where the infection came from? From the Burns plant?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The report up to date is that there is no evidence of it. People may have some ideas, but there is no real evidence.

Mr. ARGUE: And not likely to be?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You cannot be sure of that, but there is not much possibility.

Mr. QUELCH: Are the symptoms there identical with the symptoms in the Regina district?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, before asking Dr. Childs to come to the stand again, Mr. Taggart is now prepared to give evidence in connection with the

shipments to Montreal, I believe. I think probably that it might be in order now to get Mr. Taggart to explain about this shipment that has been mentioned. Is that agreeable?

Agreed.

Mr. J. G. Taggart, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, a re-search of the records of Health of Animals division still confirms the fact that no cattle were shipped out of the Intercontinental or Burns plant in Regina except those that were reported. They were all shipped to points within the old buffer zone. I asked the officers of our Market Service to try to identify shipments of cattle to Montreal in the name of Mr. McCusker and they failed to find any trace of them. Then somebody discovered that Mr. McCusker had been employed by the Saskatchewan Co-operative Marketing Association as shipper or manager, I am not sure in what capacity, and that organization had shipped cattle to Montreal from the co-operative livestock yards in Regina, but not from the Burns establishment, and not from the Intercontinental.

Secondly, the shipment was reported in the press, I think, as having originated on or having come from an infected premises, but this co-operative stockyard was not then and not at any time infected. I think the stock in that yard was inspected repeatedly, but I do not think any infected animals were found in that yard. The shipments to Montreal were made as follows:

On December 28, 1 carload of 32 head; on January 3, 1 carload of 24 head; on January 5, 1 carload of 20 head; February 1, 1 carload of 25 head; February 11, 1 carload of 22 head. Those dates, I think, are the dates shipped from Regina. The dates of arrival in Montreal are given, but I do not think I need to give you them.

Mr. JUTRAS: How many were there shipped on February 11?

The WITNESS: On February 11 the shipment was 22 head from Regina. They arrived in Montreal February 17, and those cattle were all shipped to Donovan in Montreal, and those cattle were killed in Montreal. These shipments are among those that were traced immediately after the quarantine was applied. All of those shipments on the records in either the Health of Animals division or the Marketing Service were traced to their destination and it was either determined they had been killed, or if they were alive they were inspected for symptoms of the disease.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Have you the answer to my question?

The WITNESS: I am sorry, I did not hear the question.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Well, the question is, from January 1 to February 23 was any frozen or fresh meat shipped to British Columbia, and if any, to which districts?—A. I think that in the return made yesterday, Mr. Chairman, there was a statement showing the shipments of meat of various kinds made from Regina to other points including Vancouver. There was, as I remember it, one carload at least of meat products of some kind shipped from Regina to Vancouver in January.

Q. Well, Mr. Chairman, the question that I asked was very definite. From January 1st to February 23rd were there any fresh cattle shipped to B.C. from any district in which there were any infected cattle; and, if any, to which district? That was a very definite question which I asked yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: I think probably we will let Dr. Taggart finish and then have questions.

The WITNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say about the shipments from Regina to Montreal.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Can you say, Dr. Taggart, whether any of these animals had come from any herds which were later found to be infected, in the Regina area; or, was a trace made to determine where these cattle originated that were shipped from the co-operative stockyard?—A. I cannot tell you that at the moment, Mr. Chairman. I think probably we could get it, although there is an element of doubt in that. These cattle apparently were assembled in the co-operative stockyards in Regina and I am not sure that the identity of each individual animal going to that shipment is known. They may have come from a dozen farms and been assembled there into the carload shipped out of Regina. I am not sure, I do not think the particulars of farm origin would be available for each animal. I would be glad to check up on these reports and see what information we have. I can only add that every effort was made to do that very thing; and in so far as the records of arrival and origins go, they were traced backwards, certainly. Now, that would have been very necessary with respect to any in the quarantine zone. But the general assumption was that any animal that came out of Regina, or out of the Regina area, might have been carrying the infection and therefore a very large number were traced to their destinations to see whether they might have carried the infection; but I am not so sure that that trace was carried back to their origin, but it was traced through to find out the destination and check them at that point.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Whom was the tracing done by; was it done by the mounted police?—A. The tracing was done in this way. The Health of Animals division officer at the stockyard, any stockyard, gives a health certificate for cattle being shipped from the stockyard to country points. It is illegal to move them without that health certificate. We make a survey for the purpose of our market report of the movement of all the livestock. That is done weekly and it contains the records of origin and destination, and that is published not in detail but in round figures weekly for the information of people who are trading and the farmers who are selling, and so on; so by putting the two records together we could find the origins and the destinations. That would be a clerical job in the office. Then the information is sent out to the appropriate district veterinarian and he in turn puts one of his men on the trail of that shipment. That veterinarian would then go to the farm to which the cattle had been delivered. We know where the cattle were shipped from and their destinations, and in the case of any shipments from this infected area we would give them special attention. Speaking from memory, I think the tracing went back to shipments that were made from the west as far back as October, I know that it did take in a period of time well beyond that in which we had any knowledge of the disease having been prevalent, and we traced as far as possible every shipment that might conceivably have carried infection out of the area into other parts of Canada. Quite a number of these feeder cattle have been shipped into Ontario.

Q. Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask arising out of that; will you let me ask the question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. I would simply like to ask this question. You trace these feeder cattle to their locations in Ontario and Quebec. This affects the whole livestock industry in Ontario, naturally. Having regard to the period that has elapsed and no symptoms having become in any way incipient among the various feeder cattle sent down here, is the deputy minister now in a position to say that as

far as the feeder cattle shipped to Ontario are concerned there is little fear of there being any disease spread by the cattle that came here?—A. I think that it is perfectly safe for me to say yes in answer to that question, Mr. Chairman. I think I can safely say, yes, after this lapse of time and the fact that no symptoms of the disease had been found; I think that it is very safe to assume that the disease has not spread outside of the area. Now there is still the odd chance that it might have spread outside of the buffer zone.

Q. I am speaking only of feeder cattle.—A. Certainly as far as these long range shipments are concerned it is extremely doubtful that any infection has been carried out.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wylie has the floor.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I made a statement a few minutes ago, and in the meantime another wire has come in here which I think I should read to the committee so that our newspaper friends will not have to run two stories. This is a little different from the other. I said a moment ago that we got telephone information this morning—it would be 9:30 Regina time 11:30 here—and I gave you the details of that. I have just received a wire from Dr. Christie which was put out at 2 o'clock p.m. this afternoon, just a few minutes ago Regina time and it reads:

Mr. Babiarz owner initial infected premises Weyburn. Two calves of Mr. Morris strayed to Mr. Babiarz premises and were returned home. Mr. Morris' herd developed infection. Cattle of Mr. Sam Bocian neighbour to Babiarz were mixed at pasture so Bocian herd destroyed as contact. Livestock of Mr. Endicott mixed with Babiarz so Endicott herd killed as contact. Mr. George Johnston immediate neighbour of Babiarz livestock mingled and Johnston herd became infected.

That means that there are two herds up to the moment which have become infected in addition to the initial one.

Mr. Charles Johnston brother of George let his cattle mingle with infected herd of George and were destroyed as contact. 24 cattle of Babiarz trucked to Goodwater pasture just previous to clinical infection in Babiarz home herd but were in herd within incubation period therefore these 24 while not showing clinical evidence F. and M. being destroyed to protect Goodwater pasture. 12 cattle owned Mr. Sosluski trucked to Goodwater pasture in same truck on same day as Babiarz pasture cattle therefore these cattle being destroyed as contacts to protect pasture. Total herds destroyed 6. 3 infected and 3 contact.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Wylie.

By Mr. Wylie:

Q. I just want to ask a question to follow up the question which was asked by Mr. Cruickshank this afternoon about the shipments which have been made from the Burns' plant at Regina to other Burns' plants in Vancouver. I think this information was also requested yesterday and it is something which I think should be on the record. My question is this: on that shipment to Vancouver it shows 6,121 pounds of fancy—whatever fancy means—and in the same carload there were 1,505 pounds to Calgary. I would like to have on the record just what "fancy" is. I would like to know whether it is beef, or just what it is. That is my question.—A. I haven't that sheet in front of me, but I think that was in connection with a shipment from the Burns' plant at Regina to the Burns' people at Calgary and Vancouver. The word "fancy" I am told is used in the meat packing trade to describe edible organs—heart, liver and kidneys. They use that term to describe that; why, I don't know; but that is the way they differentiate between that and other material. There were no bones in that shipment.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Well, Mr. Taggart, I want to know just what was in that shipment which went to Vancouver, whether it contained any beef, or the bones; and just what that term fancy applies to?—A. I believe the word “fancy” is used in the packing trade to apply to the organs both of beef and pork, but I am not clear with respect to this particular shipment whether one or both were included.

Mr. QUELCH: As I recall it, we were informed by Dr. Childs that the word “fancy” only referred to pork.

The WITNESS: Excuse me, in this one shipment I think—this is the one to Burns at Vancouver—reference is made to 2,800 pounds of pork ribs, that would be spare ribs presumably.

Mr. QUELCH: The word “fancy” in that case also referred to pork, according to what Dr. Childs told us yesterday.

The WITNESS: And in the preceding shipments from Burns to Burns Montreal there were 23,143 pounds of beef.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Dr. Taggart, the shipment to which I referred as having been made from the Burns' plant at Regina to the Burns' plant at Vancouver, and as I understand it there was beef also in that shipment to Vancouver; I refer to the shipment made under date of December 31, in connection with which the word “fancy” is used—whatever that means. What I want to know now from you is what that term means? Who knows what was in the shipment? Surely somebody knows what that means, “fancy”.—A. Well, Mr. Chairman this word “fancy” as I said, is used in the meat packing trade to describe edible organs—heart, liver, kidneys and so on.

Q. From what?—A. It applies to both beef and pork edible organs.

Q. Is there any way in which we could find out what that shipment was?—A. I do not know whether it is possible at this stage to find out anything further than what I have stated; that there was 2,800 pounds of pork ribs. There would certainly be no beef bones in that shipment. Whether it was organs derived from beef or pork this does not disclose, and I doubt whether at this date it would be possible to find out.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. The question I want to ask, Mr. Chairman has to do with the shipment of meat out of the Burns' plant. I notice that in Dr. James' report of January 4 that a bull carcass on examination was found to have stomatitis, and it says, the other part of the carcass was found to be fit for food. In the case of a carcass, part of which has been condemned and the rest declared fit human food was there any such part of carcass shipped out of the Burns' plant to other parts of Canada or to other parts of Saskatchewan?—A. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that that question puts me in an awkward spot. It should be asked of the technical people. I think I had better not attempt to answer it. It is quite common I know in packing plants to condemn parts of carcasses and for the balance of the carcass to be passed as edible.

Q. You do not know whether or not those parts of carcasses were shipped out of the plant?—A. The condemned parts?

Q. No, not the condemned parts, the parts that were approved for food.—A. No, I cannot tell you that.

Q. They could have been shipped out, couldn't they?—A. I really don't know. Dr. Childs or Dr. Rose could tell you about that better than I could.

Q. If they were not condemned there would be no way to identify them from parts of other animals?—A. I would assume that if they were passed as

being fit for food that would be all that would be required to make them available. The Act requires that all meat be inspected and approved, every part of it.

Q. And it may have been taken and sent out in one of these shipments that went all over Canada.

Mr. QUELCH: Referring to the telegram that was read, I take it that the cattle in Mr. Johnson's herd were allowed to mix or mingle in with the herd that had become infected. Does that mean these cattle went out and mingled with another herd after he knew that his herd had become infected, or were they actually mingling with his herd before it was realized that that herd was infected?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It was both. It was reported that they were reported as being infected, but as to whether or not the farmer himself knew that I cannot tell you. There would be no report of them having been infected at the time this happened.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hetland.

Mr. HETLAND: I do not know if I should ask Dr. Taggart this question, but I would imagine that quite a number of people would be interested in bone meal. Is the bone meal made up so that this disease would not get into the meal which was shipped all over the west? And what about the meat scraps? Are they protected so there would not be any danger?

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I think any information on that should properly come from the veterinarians, on the methods of sterilization and handling. I would prefer not to attempt to answer that question.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. The day before yesterday, when Dr. Taggart was giving evidence, I asked for three pieces of information or three returns to be brought in, in connection with the 207 cattle, the 145 sheep, and the 50 swine at the Burns plant on December 28, when the first quarantine was imposed. That information has not come in as yet. My first question was: what was the disposal of them, so far as live animals are concerned? My second question was—I presume this is the thing we have here now which shows the meat which went out of that plant during that period; and my third question was in connection with any livestock which went into the plant subsequent to January 17, when the quarantine was lifted. I wonder if Dr. Taggart has those answers?—A. I have not any further facts on that particular situation at the moment, Mr. Chairman. But I was under the impression that those facts all were on the record. However, we will re-check and if they are not, perhaps we could segregate out from the documents a special statement showing the intake and the out-go of livestock at that particular plant.

Q. We have had quite a bit of discussion on it, and I do not think it was clear in anybody's mind as to exactly what happened to that livestock; and I asked particularly at that time for those three returns and three pieces of information and it was promised that they would be brought in on the next day, which was yesterday; but they have not come in as yet. At the time we were told there were 52 shipments from this area to various places in Saskatchewan. But later it was said that there were 52 head of cattle, not 52 shipments that were made; that was part of the ambiguity in connection with that thing and that was the reason I asked for definite returns to be brought in showing the disposition of those animals. I think we should have them.—A. At the time that question was raised I produced a statement which I think is on the record in the proceedings of the first day, showing the disposition of all the cattle moved out from the Burns establishment.

Mr. JUTRAS: You mean alive?

The WITNESS: I mean alive; that is to say, during the period from November 1951 down to the end of February 1952. Now there were two statements that made up that information which I produced, including the record as to the shipment from the Saskatchewan Co-operative Stockyards, even though it was not directly related to the Burns shipment. Now the only thing I can do is to assume that the cattle which were not shipped out of there must have gone through the plant for slaughter.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. We did not get the number of cattle shipped out of the area, or the sheep or swine. You were talking, to begin with, of 52 head of cattle. But eventually you said it was 52 shipments made, and we never found out what those shipments consisted of.—A. There must be some misunderstanding and I shall endeavour to get it straightened out because I must have misunderstood the request. We will re-examine those figures and try to put them in shape so that we can supply the information that is wanted.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Decore.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Dr. Taggart a question in connection with a Canadian Press release as it appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of the 1st of May. This is the heading:—

Might be guilty of delay in foot and mouth case, deputy minister.

Then further on it says that he—referring to the deputy—disclosed that there was a lapse of more than two weeks in his report to Mr. Gardiner who was absent at that time on the west coast. I was present at that time during the first days of the proceedings and that was not my impression. So I have been wondering whether I was right or wrong in my impressions.—A. Mr. Chairman, I noticed that report. I suppose I have no right to quarrel with what the newspaper reporters report. But I think that I told the committee when I was examined on that point that I had my first clear knowledge of the fact there was a disease in Regina or in the Regina area described as vesicular stomatitis, on or about the 2nd of February.

Mr. BROWNE: Would you mind repeating that, please?

The WITNESS: I said that I had my first clear recollection of having information about this disease being in the Regina area in the early days of February. Now I checked back on the matter and I find that the minister was away from Ottawa from the night of the 2nd until the morning of the 29th. For a considerable part of that time he was at the west coast. Again, it is not my duty to inquire what the minister is doing when he is away, but I was informed that he was on holidays on this part of the journey; and in the absence of the minister the acting minister, Mr. Winters was here and he was in Ottawa from the 2nd of February until the 16th, and during that time I had several conversations with Mr. Winters. The first one which is recorded was on the 11th of February. And subsequently, the reports came in from Regina from Dr. Childs expressing real concern about the possibility of this thing being more than stomatitis.

Mr. BROWNE: I ask the witness what report is he referring to specifically there? What report are you referring to specifically there?

The WITNESS: The report from Dr. Childs.

Mr. BROWNE: Yes?

The WITNESS: He wired, either that or there was a telephone conversation as well. On the occasion when it became necessary to quarantine the area

formally as a precaution, I reported to the Prime Minister and action was taken immediately on the recommendation that I made. Now it is still quite possible that the committee may wish to charge me with negligence in not having reported to my minister, but I did so when I realized the seriousness of the situation towards the 18th of February, and I telephoned to Mr. Gardiner and informed him of developments. In all cases up to that time and in all conversations up to that time I reported that this disease there which had been diagnosed earlier as vesicular stomatitis was becoming more alarming and there appeared to be a possibility that it was foot and mouth disease. That is why I reported that in conversations with people to whom I was responsible, but I did not report that it was foot and mouth disease. However, I said it looked so serious from all the reports I had received that we had better regard it as foot and mouth disease. I said we had now better take all the precautions that would be taken if it were foot and mouth disease, and they were taken.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. That would be from the 11th to the 18th?—A. On the 18th when the actual move was made to close in.

Q. On the reports—

The CHAIRMAN: Just a second. Mr. Decore is not finished.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. My reason for asking this question is that I recollect a question put to the deputy minister by Mr. Browne, when he wanted to know if communication had been made to the minister and in what way, and you said it was made to him by letter; and the other question put to him was: why was not this communication made sooner; I presume by wire or by telephone, and the deputy made a statement that he felt he had been guilty of delay in advising the Minister of Agriculture of what had transpired. I thought it was in connection with the wire or telephone.

Mr. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that probably I was the one who asked the question. I remember distinctly saying to the deputy minister: when was the first intimation by anyone that this might possibly be foot and mouth and he definitely stated: the 1st or 2nd of February.

Mr. DECORE: No!

Mr. CHARLTON: Oh yes, sir. I did not say definitely "foot and mouth disease".

Mr. DECORE: That is different.

Mr. CHARLTON: Do not misunderstand me. I asked the deputy: when was the first intimation that this might be foot and mouth? And he said definitely: the first or second of February. He did not say definitely "foot and mouth"; but he said that was his first intimation, and that it had been mentioned to him by some of his officials. As I understand it today, Dr. Taggart, you are saying now that you did not know until the 18th?

The WITNESS: Oh no, Mr. Chairman. As I think I have said several times, the first intimation about this disease that I remember distinctly having received came to me in the very early days of February; and at that time it was reported to me that it had been diagnosed as vesicular stomatitis, and that the symptoms of that disease resembled at least superficially those of foot and mouth; and therefore there was automatically a doubt that it might be foot and mouth; and it was on the basis of that report to me—

Mr. ARGUE: There was a sufficient doubt in your mind?

By Mr. Decore:

Q. Which you reported to the acting minister at that time, as soon as you perceived or thought that it might be foot and mouth?—A. No, Mr. Chairman, I did not report immediately to anybody because, as I told you, my own minister was away; but I discussed the matter with Mr. Young and later with either Mr. Young and Dr. Childs, or with Mr. Young and Dr. Hall. I am not sure whether all three were present, or just two at a time; and the evidence that was available still led the veterinarians to believe that it was vesicular stomatitis. Therefore we just took all precautions, as I was informed, to check, to identify, and to hold the position, without any further discussion with anybody else. That is my recollection of what happened during those days.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Harkness, and then Mr. Jutras.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. At the first meeting we had of this committee you were asked when you first reported this outbreak of disease to Mr. Gardiner and you said it was on the 18th; and then I asked you if you had reported it to the acting minister before that, and you said that you had reported it to the acting minister a week before; but you have now just said that you reported it on the 11th, to the acting minister. Now, I also took from what you said, that you reported it on the 11th, and from that time on you had very strongly in your mind the possibility that it might be foot and mouth disease. Is that correct?—A. When this disease reached that stage, my assumption was in discussing the thing with other officials of the department that we were to take all precautions that could be taken on the chance or the assumption that this would be or might be foot and mouth. Now, the weight of evidence at that time still appeared to indicate that it was not, but nevertheless there was sufficient doubt in the situation to regard it with great apprehension and to take whatever precautions could be taken short of actually saying it was and declaring it to be foot and mouth disease—which appeared to everybody at that time an extremely dangerous thing to do while the weight of veterinarian opinion was that we had vesicular stomatitis only.

Mr. ARGUE: What date was that?

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. When you discussed this matter with Mr. Winters the acting minister on the 11th, and subsequently, you discussed with him the possibility that it was foot and mouth disease—you must have done so because you said I think that you were then taking precautions that would be appropriate if by any chance it did develop that it was foot and mouth disease—although it was still thought that it was not?—A. The premises on which this disease had been found, as I was informed, had been quarantined and we went all through that evidence. Then, shortly after, and I do not remember the exact date, but during that period of time Dr. Childs went to Regina to give it personal attention and, if necessary, to take further action—which of course he did.

The situation there was that from the 7th or 8th of February until the 18th was a period of great uncertainty as to whether this might turn out to be foot and mouth disease. That was clear in the minds of the people with whom I was in contact.

Q. You said a moment ago that during this period from the 11th on you took precautions which would be appropriate if this developed to be foot and mouth disease although it looked as if it were not foot and mouth disease at that time. I would like to ask what those precautions were. Was any quarantine imposed at that time? I would think one of the most appropriate precautions, if it was thought there was a strong possibility that it was foot and mouth

disease, would be that quarantine should be put on?—A. My understanding is that individual quarantines were applied or in effect on the premises concerned and that seemed to be all that could be done under the circumstances without coming to a decision which nobody was prepared to take at that moment—no veterinarian adviser was prepared to take that position.

Q. In the period from the 11th to 18th you say individual quarantines were in effect. There was no quarantine in effect during that period on the Burns plant?—A. No, I think the Burns plant had been released previously and the quarantine was not reimposed until the 17th.

Q. Yes, I think it was the 17th?—A. According to the information that is on hand the Burns plant was free of this particular disease.

Q. During the period from the 11th to the 17th there was no quarantine in effect on the Burns plant. Was there a quarantine during that period on the Waas farm?—A. This is on the record Mr. Chairman—the exact dates of the application and lifting of those quarantines.

Q. Is it not a fact then, that during the period generally speaking there were no quarantines in effect in spite of the fact that you had become seriously alarmed at that time that it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. As I said the record of the application and lifting of the quarantines is here. I have not it in my mind but it is in the record in front of us.

Q. Perhaps I had better phrase the question a little differently. In view of the fact that you were at least seriously alarmed that this situation might develop into foot and mouth disease, during the period from the 11th to the 17th, did you consider the imposition of quarantine?—A. I did not personally consider that question of further quarantines. They had been applied or were being applied from time to time by the veterinary people. That was in the hands of the veterinary people and it was not my responsibility to deal with the matter of quarantine.

Q. I would think the primary thing here was quarantine and if that was not done, and if you say appropriate precautions were taken in case it did turn out to be foot and mouth disease, just what were those precautions?—A. The precautions the veterinarians were taking were continued check and inspection against possible spread of the disease, maintenance of quarantines wherever they were warranted or appeared to be warranted, and the final action that was taken was the application of the general quarantine on the 18th of February when the disease had still not been diagnosed as foot and mouth disease—and it was not so diagnosed until nearly a week later.

Q. The actual fact is that during that period the only precautions that were taken were continued inspection of certain herds?—A. Now again the record may not bear me out but I think during that time samples were taken from animals and directed to the Hull lab for confirmation or for technical aid in diagnosing the disease.

Q. I must say I would hardly look upon the actions that were taken as appropriate precautions when considerable discussion was going on and the alarm being spread that it might be foot and mouth disease.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. I am not sure my question should be directed to the present witness or to Dr. Childs but at any rate I will let the witness decide. The thing that is foremost in the minds of those of us in Manitoba, being neighbours of Saskatchewan, is to what extent is the control airtight over the quarantine area at the present time? I wonder if it would be possible to have a clear picture of the control that is presently exercised over this area to protect those outside?—A. That is the present movement of livestock outward from the quarantine or buffer zone?

Q. That is one of the points, but as far as protection is concerned so that people will know that they are protected as far as is humanly possible, for instance, is it still permissible to remove cattle from that area under permit or otherwise?—A. No—to take them out of the area?

Q. I mean to take them out of the whole area?—A. No.

Q. Is it permissible to remove things other than animals, such as trucks and cars that may be coming out of the quarantine area?—A. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that there is a whole serious of regulations and controls in effect in both the quarantine area and the buffer zone. There is a considerable number—I do not know how many at the moment—of police officers, and a large number of veterinarians on the job to enforce those regulations. Now the control of that area is in the hands of the Health and Animals division office in Regina and Dr. Wells is in active charge of that control program. That includes not only detection and destruction of diseased animals but all measures of that sort, and also all other ancillary measures needed to control traffic, people, the movement of animals and things like that which might carry infection.

I am not in a position to give the details exactly of what regulations are in effect and I think it would be better to get that information from Dr. Wells when he comes here next week.

Q. May I make a suggestion? I think this is possibly the most important question of all at the moment so may I suggest to the witness that the department prepare a written memorandum, if you like, setting out clearly the whole story on that score—the story of all the protection that is afforded.

I know that if you produce all the regulations there will be a tremendous pile of them but some of them may not mean very much; it may be very hard to get at anything. I think the department would be rendering a real service if they would digest this thing and draft it clearly to give us a complete idea of the protection we have—"we" being those that live outside the area—particularly regarding movement.

I noticed in the early stages that certain vehicles were permitted to go out, and under circumstances such as that I think it is important for us to know exactly what the regulations require of them before they can move. We should know the complete story on it.

There have been so many things said on it that it is very hard for me at any rate, and others apparently, to know exactly what the story is on that score. It would help all of the people in the neighbouring provinces if that could be done.—A. I am quite sure that can be done and it will be done if the committee wishes it.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott?

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Mr. Taggart, how long have you been with the department that you are now with?—A. In my present position?

Q. Yes?—A. Since the 1st of March 1939.

Mr. ARGUE: 1949?

The WITNESS: I beg your pardon, 1949.

Mr. SINNOTT: When was the first information you got of the stomatitis disease—in January?

Mr. HARKNESS: He told us the 2nd or 3rd of February.

The WITNESS: In the early days of February 1952.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. I have here a wire from Regina, Saskatchewan dated the 28th of December:

"One hundred and thirty seven steers and seventy heifers of which thirty head are exhibiting symptoms of infectious vesicular stomatitis in Burns and Co Feed Lots Establishment Twenty Three E. Premises quarantined and report by Dr. N. V. James being mailed to you. Healthy animals allowed to be slaughtered.

(SGD) "N. D. CHRISTIE"

Do you know anything about that report?—A. I presume—I do not remember the exact document—but I presume that would be to Dr. Childs office from Dr. Christie.

Q. Was this report made known to you at that time?—A. No, no; not that I have any recollection of at all. As I have said before my first recollection of having been clearly informed of the existence of this disease was in the early days of February.

Q. When did Dr. Childs first inform you of this wire?—A. I do not suppose I was ever informed of that particular wire, but if I was it would be long afterwards. It would be a matter of examining back into the records—and that particular wire would not normally come to my attention.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright?

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Mr. Taggart, you have stated that it was February 2 you were first notified officially or any other way—A. About that date. I do not know myself the particular day.

Q. As I understand it you stated a moment ago that from that date on every effort was made to check, identify, and hold the disease. Did you issue any instructions to any of your departments with regard to the method with which they would check, identify, and hold the disease?—A. No, no, Mr. Chairman, I did not issue any special instructions on this at that time. I merely inquired of the measures that were being taken and whether proper precautions were being taken, and I was assured that they were being taken.

Q. You were satisfied yourself they were being taken?—A. The point was, the position did not appear to anybody who reported to me at that time to be a serious situation.

Q. And you had no doubt in your own mind as to whether this was vesicular stomatitis or a more dangerous infection?—A. I had no real doubt about that because I did not know enough about the disease to have a doubt. I knew that the external symptoms bore some resemblance to foot and mouth disease, and that was about that for the time being.

Q. And as a result of your knowledge they were the same, you did not take any particular precaution or give any particular instructions?—A. No, none whatever, except to make inquiry as to whether precautions were being taken, and I was assured that they were.

Q. Were you told at that time what these precautions were?—A. Not in detail, no.

Q. You did not inquire about the detail?—A. No.

Q. Yet you say you were satisfied with them, although you did not inquire as to the detail?—A. Yes; I must confess, Mr. Chairman, I cannot now, from the nature of things, inquire into details of that kind and decide whether they are adequate or otherwise. They are in the professional and technical field and it is not possible for any one person to rule on detail of that sort in so many different fields.

Q. I would not expect that you would in a great many cases, but in a case where there apparently was doubt as to whether this might be a more dangerous and infectious disease than it was, I would think that some inquiries would have been made or some instructions issued.

Mr. QUELCH: When the minister draws up the details of all the measures taken in the quarantine area, as referred to by Mr. Jutras, I wonder if he would also report just exactly what is meant by quarantine of an individual farm. I take it that the cattle would either be confined in a barn or a corral, or would it be that the cattle were confined to a pasture. If that would be the case, there would still be chances of contamination of stock in adjacent fields, from cattle walking up and down the line roads, and possibly cattle contacting each other with their noses over the fences.

The WITNESS: My understanding is that specific instructions are given to an individual, and instructions are not the same in all cases. Dr. Wells, I am sure, can tell you what the practice is in different circumstances in those areas, but it is my understanding that specific directions are given to individuals concerned as to what he may or may not do.

Mr. QUELCH: Will you include that in your report that you make out?

The WITNESS: That can be produced without any difficulty, but whether it can be produced in a single document of that kind I am not sure.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Mr. Taggart, did you tell us that the first intimation you had of this disease was February 2 or February 7?—A. Around the 2nd of February, and I am not nailing myself to that particular day because I have no means of identifying that day.

Q. And you say you were aware the disease was reported as stomatitis, and knowing, as you say, something of the outward appearance, that you did have a suspicion—I believe you used the word “suspicion” a few minutes ago—that it might have been something else. That is correct, I believe?—A. Well, I am not very sure, Mr. Chairman, of the implication there, but any suspicions that I had were based solely on the information given to me, because I have no personal knowledge of this disease nor of the foot-and-mouth disease, either, for that matter.

Q. Mr. Young is head of the Production Service?—A. Right.

Q. Did you discuss it with anyone else before the 17th, shall we say?—A. Oh, yes, subsequently, and within a few days I had discussed it with Dr. Childs, Dr. Hall and Mr. Young.

Q. When did you first discuss that with Dr. Childs?—A. I am not sure of that date. It would be within a few days after the first knowledge I had of it.

Q. And when did you discuss it with Dr. Hall previously to having discussed it with Dr. Childs, or after?—A. I think probably that I discussed it first with Dr. Childs and Mr. Young, and later with Dr. Hall and Mr. Young.

Q. Just roughly, what were your discussions with these gentlemen, as you recollect them?—A. Just a repetition of the early discussions as to the reports that this disease might, conceivably be foot-and-mouth.

Q. Who said it could conceivably be?—A. We all talked about that.

Q. You all talked about that?—A. But the conclusion of each discussion was, “Well, on the evidence so far it cannot be”. There was no disposition at that stage to conclude that they had foot-and-mouth.

Q. In your discussions with Dr. Hall and Dr. Childs and Mr. Young, did any one of those ever suggest that perhaps a test should be made of cattle that the regular animal inoculation tests should be made other than the horse inoculation tests? Did anyone suggest to you the possibility that perhaps

that tests should be made?—A. I do not remember discussing the technique of diagnosis in any detail with these men.

Q. In any detail?—A. I was concerned to know whether the disease was spreading and whether there was any probability of more serious trouble developing.

Q. Was Dr. Mitchell in on any of these discussions?—A. At a later date, I would have had discussions with all the men, Dr. Hall, Dr. Childs, Dr. Mitchell and Mr. Young, between the early part of February and the 12th or so.

Q. You had discussions with Dr. Mitchell on the 12th?—A. Dr. Mitchell would have been in some part of the discussion.

Q. And when you were discussing the matter of the outbreak of the disease with Dr. Mitchell, can you recollect whether he suggested that perhaps the laboratory in Hull should be used to analyse material from the infected animals?—A. I do not recall that suggestion coming from Dr. Mitchell. There would be no reason why he should make that suggestion because the laboratory was there, available, and had been used on many occasions for diagnostic purposes.

Q. Of course there would be a fairly good reason. The first outbreak was on November 26 and no test were made to find out whether it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. Dr. Mitchell, so far as I recall, made no such suggestion.

Q. Then on the 13th February a telegram went out from Dr. Hall reporting a conversation he had with Dr. Carlson. That telegram went to Dr. Christie in Regina, asking that materials be sent into the Hull laboratory. Were you aware that such action might be taken, or were you aware only after that action was taken?—A. By Dr. Hall?

Q. Yes, did you know about it at that time?—A. No.

Q. When did you first become aware that Dr. Hall had instructed that material be sent to the Hull laboratory?—A. Considerably later, I should think it would be as late as the 18th, or a date like that.

Q. Well, now, in looking over your experience as deputy minister since you were here, and the experience you had in this disease, do you feel, assuming this disease has cleared up now as we hope it is, if there should be outbreaks two years from now, say, of stomatitis, something similar to the outbreak on the Waas farm, and it was brought to your attention, what would you do?

Mr. DECORE: What does your book say on that?

The WITNESS: It is a difficult thing to say what one might do two years from now, but I think it would be safe to make this observation, that the people concerned with the control of the disease would certainly profit from the experience they had during this one.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. You would imagine they would send the material to the laboratory in Hull or take field tests to determine whether it was foot and mouth disease, and the type as was finally done towards the end of February?—A. I should think they would take the best possible action, and it might be quite different from what appears today.

Q. That is not quite the question. I said, if a disease appeared to be the same what action do you think should be taken in the future. I think that is a reasonable question, and I think it is an important question, to see that we do not go on at another time for months before we know what we are dealing with.—A. As I suggested, Mr. Chairman, I think the thing that would be done would be that all those concerned with the disease would take every measure that seemed to be sound and reasonable and certainly would draw on the experience of the present outbreak.

Q. One of the first things they would do in your opinion would be to check the materials at the Hull laboratory?—A. My opinion would support the use of any approved device or method.

Q. Including the good laboratory you have in Hull?—A. That is a perfectly obvious thing to do.

Q. To test it in Hull?—A. It might not be in Hull.

Q. To make field tests in the field similar to the tests that were made in Hull?—A. Well, the procedure that they attempted to follow in Regina was to make the field tests.

Q. Field tests amongst a number of animals in February?—A. And whether they might attempt to repeat that in future outbreaks, is difficult to forecast.

Q. If a situation like this is brought to your attention again sometime in the future, would it be your opinion that such tests be made along with other precautions?

Mr. DECORE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What is going to happen two years from now is probably important, but in order to explain what devices would be used would probably take a whole half-day, so I do not think that is in order at all.

Mr. SINNOTT: What about the time limit?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Argue has one more minute.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I think the suggestion that the tests should be made in Hull should be answered quickly, and as far as I understand the answer I believe it is the deputy minister's opinion that everything possible should be done, and that very likely one of the things that would be done would be proper field tests.—A. That seems highly probable to me if intelligent people are still in control.

Q. Still in control! Then do you think, in your opinion did the veterinary director general use every possible precaution throughout the history of this disease?

Mr. STEWART: I do not think that is a proper question. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not know that one executive of the government should be asked a question as to the efficiency of another one. That is for this committee to decide after we hear all the evidence. I think it is very unfair to ask one witness in the department whether the other fellow did everything that should have been done. We will decide that in the committee.

Mr. ARGUE: We will decide on the basis of the evidence, and I think one of the most important pieces of evidence is the opinion of the work of that official by the deputy minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Your time is up Mr. Argue.

Mr. ARGUE: I had asked a question and I think I am entitled to an answer and then I will sit down.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It is not a proper question.

Mr. ARGUE: I think it is a very proper question.

Mr. STEWART: It is a question that this committee will decide.

Mr. ARGUE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This committee has to decide who was inefficient and who was efficient, who was to blame—and somebody is to blame—and that is what this committee is set up for, and the only way the committee can come to a sound conclusion is to have every possible bit of evidence from witnesses, and I suggest with respect, Mr. Chairman, that the best possible evidence we could get is the opinion of the deputy minister as to one official.

Mr. DECORE: We can then go a step further. Probably this witness can give us his opinion of the minister. Of course, we know your opinion of the minister.

Mr. ARGUE: I have a high opinion of the minister in a great many ways. Mr. Chairman, are you going to rule that was an improper question?

The CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Taggart will answer your question; then, Mr. Cardiff and Mr. Gour.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that I have every confidence in Dr. Childs and his organization. It is an extremely difficult thing to stand in public and pass judgment on a particular man and I would beg that the committee do not compel me to do that in too great detail. But we had an organization there headed by experienced veterinarians who had come up from the bottom; not Dr. Childs alone, Dr. Hall and Dr. Wells and Dr. Rose and Dr. Stewart; all men with experience and knowledge. We had similarly experienced and able men in the field. Now, any person who has to work with a human organization knows that all men in the organization are not equally able, and we all know that there are spots in every organization that are weak because of the man who happens to be in a particular spot. If we had perfect men, and particularly if we had a perfect minister and perfect deputy minister, we would have a perfect organization down below. We had we thought as good an organization as we could get.

Mr. ARGUE: Do you still think so?

The WITNESS: We had competent men in the field in charge of this work. Now, judgment might be passed afterwards, as a matter of hindsight; but I must confess I do not know what else I could have done in the circumstances but to continue the confidence in these men that I had at the time and still have. That is as near as I can come to answering this question.

Mr. CARDIFF: The question I had intended to ask Dr. Taggart might perhaps better be directed to the veterinary director general himself. But I would like to say this, I do think that when he made the statement himself that he might have been guilty of negligence in not notifying the minister earlier; personally, I do not think that makes very much difference; but as I see it, it goes much further than that and I do think that there was a certain amount of negligence on somebody's part, and who that somebody is we are going to find out if we can before this committee is over. I had intended to ask Dr. Taggart some questions, but I will ask those questions later on. I do not know that he is the right man to whom to direct those questions. When I get the right man I am going to put some questions to him and I want straight answers because I am going to put straight questions.

Mr. GOUR: Mr. Chairman, the witness, Dr. Taggart, has been very close to this thing throughout. He has a general knowledge of everything that happened, and he knows the employees who are responsible. This did happen and this emergency arose in the west. I am sure Dr. Taggart knows something about how this thing has developed in other countries. That is a thing which just comes so quickly that many times it is there before you know what is happening. That was the case in our country and it was also the case in Mexico and the United States, and in Great Britain. As far as I am concerned, I desire to express every confidence in the manner in which the situation was handled. There are a great many things which can happen without the deputy minister knowing all the details about them. I have every confidence in Dr. Taggart and I am satisfied with the evidence he has given here about their regulations and everything that happened. As I understand it, not only the federal department here has responsibility but that some measure of responsibility also rests with the province, and I am quite confident that so far as both those agencies are concerned they did what they thought was best at the time, and it did not become apparent until the last moment just what type of disease they were dealing with. As far as I understand it they made every effort to find out what the disease was and they all agreed that it

was the disease known as stomatitis; and it was not only one or two of them, but there were six or seven or more in the field at the same time concerned with the same inquiry and they were all agreed on the fact that at that time it did not appear to be a serious contagious disease. You will recall the evidence on that point, and also the fact that in most cases, in the early stages at least, the cattle got better; but it finally became established that the disease was a serious one, and as soon as that became apparent effective steps were taken to deal with it.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this gentleman is making a speech, I suggest that he should be asking questions.

The CHAIRMAN: I think there have been quite a few of the members who have spoken at this stage and I think that it is only fair as this is the first time that he has had the floor to let him continue.

Mr. GOUR: I am only taking my ten minutes.

Mr. BROWNE: You have taken up time enough now. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that speeches are out of order.

Mr. GOUR: All right then, I will ask questions.

By Mr. Gour:

Q. Dr. Taggart, are you satisfied with the work that was done up to the time that you were advised that this was foot-and-mouth disease; were you satisfied that everything had been done to find out what kind of a disease it was. You were satisfied of that, is that right, doctor.—A. Well, as I said Mr. Chairman, in reply to your previous question, I had confidence in the organization that had been built up over the years, of competent experienced men. I also appreciate that when you come to look backwards you can see where something else might have been done in the light of subsequent experience. It is much easier to do that than it is to decide what ought to be done at the moment of decision.

Q. And you came to that decision after you had received advice from your chief veterinary, Dr. Childs, and from Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Young; is that right?—A. Right.

Q. I wanted to ask you that question although I know that it has been asked a number of times; I also know that some questions have been asked as many as ten times. And I want to ask you this, Dr. Taggart. After you were advised, when the time came, you advised the minister, but before doing that you made quite sure as to what it was? Is that right?—A. Correct, yes.

Q. Is that right?—A. Yes.

Q. And after that you took the matter up with your staff, the employees of your department, to make sure that everything would be done that could be done, and you were quite satisfied that the officers concerned knew what should be done and they were given every opportunity to do everything possible to find out what it was?—A. That is correct.

Q. And you authorized them to do everything, or anything needful to deal with the matter? Is that right?—A. I think that is correct.

Q. Therefore, I am satisfied with what was done and I am satisfied with what Dr. Taggart did. I am confident that the steps taken will establish a measure of confidence among the farmers of the country and will be an assurance to them that from now on everything is going to be done that possible can be done to stop the spread of this disease. I am quite confident that Dr. Taggart has seen that everything possible that could be done was done to get the situation under control throughout the country, and the people of the country will be satisfied with what you have done up to now.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Catherwood:

By Mr. Catherwood:

Q. I have questions that I would like to ask Dr. Taggart, Mr. Chairman, because he is the man in charge of the application of government policy. In view of all that has been said I am wondering if the department have given consideration to asking for assistance, or to getting someone from England to come and assist in combatting the disease in the Regina area?—A. Dr. Childs could give you more detail about that than I could, Mr. Chairman; but we had Sir Thomas Dalling, the head of the British Veterinary Service, come out here last summer—and he came out at our expense, in part at least—and our men had a very thorough review of the situation. We have had doctors on our staff in the U.K. I was there in mid-June when I met Sir Thomas Dalling and had a conversation with him. Dr. Mitchell I am sure has close contact with the veterinary people, especially the research people, in the U.K. I think all our contacts there have been very good, the information going in both directions has been complete and the co-operation which has been given has been of the best; but we did not ask for any special personnel to be sent out to Canada in connection with this outbreak. We got material, and, of course, got all the information that was requested.

Q. I have one other question that I would like to ask Dr. Taggart: in the matter of the quarantine area, has the quarantine been strictly enforced. I see no mention of the Department of National Defence ever having been asked to assist in enforcing the quarantine in the affected area. Has any assistance been asked for and are they assisting at the present time?—A. We have the assistance of the police in enforcing the quarantine and all the regulation associated with the control, but not the army, we did not ask for the army to assist us.

By Mr. Wood:

Q. My question perhaps should be directed to Dr. Childs, but I was going to ask the witness if he was satisfied that all the infected areas were fully quarantined in a manner that cattle outside the quarantine area cannot contact cattle inside the area; also, are the cattle in the closed, affected area segregated from the buffer area. It seems to me the cattle are apt to be left running free, and I was wondering if adequate precautions had been taken?—A. I would like to suggest again, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Wells will be here next week, also Dr. Carlson and Dr. James; they will be here and they are actively on the job and they could give you the information about that which I could not possibly; so I suggest it might be well to reserve these questions of a specific nature concerning administration of the controls of the quarantine and in the buffer zones for the men who are actually on the job and have personal knowledge.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. In connection with that may I ask you this, how many outbreaks of this disease have they had in England? Do you know, roughly? You said that there were 7 in the United States. Do you know how many they have had in England?—A. Mr. Chairman, it would only be a guess that I could hazard, but when I was over in England I knew they told me that they had something like 100, or maybe more than 100, in the year preceding my visit there.

Q. And your statement there is that in England they have the most outstanding men on this disease that there is in the world; is that correct?—A. Yes, they certainly have good men.

Q. And in the United States they also have good men?—A. I believe so.

Q. And they have had 7 outbreaks, or 9 outbreaks in England with these experts in charge of things and with serums and with all their tests; is that correct?—A. That is correct, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for Dr. Taggart? If there are no more questions for him I see that Dr. Childs is with us.

Mr. CHARLTON: I have just one question that I would like to ask Dr. Taggart, if you will permit me.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Dr. Taggart, you said that you did not know anything about the disease even being stomatitis until the first or second week in February.—A. No.

Q. And up until that time you said that you had received no information that it might be foot and mouth disease—well, Dr. Taggart, you did ask Dr. Childs and Dr. Hall about this around those dates, did you not?—A. By the 1st of February or during the early days of February, yes.

Q. During the first week of February?—A. Well, yes.

Q. And it was in your mind about that time that there might be the possibility of foot and mouth disease; and then you went on to say that the administration thought they had taken about all the precautions which could be taken, so far as you were aware in view of the possibility that it might be foot and mouth disease? Is that true? Immediately you found out yourself that there was a chance of foot and mouth disease? I am trying to say this: the moment you found out that it might be foot and mouth disease, you took all the precautions within your power to see that the disease was treated as if it were foot and mouth disease?—A. Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could attempt to clarify my position? What I thought I said or what I intended to say was that my first knowledge of this disease which broke out at Regina and was diagnosed as vesicular stomatitis—my first knowledge of that disease came in the early days of February; and at that time when it first came to my attention I was told that the symptoms resembled at least superficially those of foot and mouth; that suggestion associated foot and mouth in my mind with vesicular stomatitis of course; but I was not convinced, as far as I was concerned, that we had foot and mouth until I got final confirmation on the 24th or 25th of February; but there were in my mind growing doubts and there were apprehensions in the veterinary staff, particularly in the last week before the final confirmation, but I never admitted, so far as I was concerned, mentally that we actually had foot and mouth until the final confirmation of it.

Q. I did not even suggest that you admitted it.—A. I did not admit it to myself, I mean.

Q. Even though you did not admit it to anyone else, you had the idea in your mind that there was a possibility, because of the very fact that there were similar symptoms to foot and mouth disease. Now, the thing I want to say is this: would you have gone on statutory leave two days after you found that out?—A. Well, Mr. Chairman, I very rarely go on statutory leave; I think if I do go, I do not record it. Perhaps that is the explanation.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. There is one question which has not yet been asked. A number of representations have been made to me, to ascertain the facts, and it has to do with certain purebred bulls belonging to the dominion government which were kept in the Regina Livestock premises at the Regina fair grounds. Does the minister know or have any information that in November and December there were a number of purebred bulls kept there for artificial insemination purposes?—A. Just in a general way; I know that those bulls are there, and that our livestock branch has a barn or part of a barn—perhaps a whole barn—and that they are under the care of officers of the livestock branch.

Q. I am sorry, but I could not hear you.—A. I know that we have that barn and have had it for many years on the Exhibition Grounds, in which we harbour or house bulls which belong to the branch.

Q. They were there from November to February, were they not?—A. I presume they were there, until they were slaughtered, during the fall and winter months. I presume that.

Q. These bulls, these dominion government bulls were slaughtered towards the end of February?—A. I have not got the date. That is on the record, but I have not got the date in my mind.

Q. But you can provide it. What would be the date, possibly?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The 2nd of March,

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. The 2nd of March; and when did those Dominion government bulls become contacts with animals that were subject to stomatitis or whatever the disease was?—A. I believe that is on the record too, but I cannot give you the answer.

Q. But you can furnish it?—A. It is on the records that were turned in yesterday, I think.

Q. Can you say when the contacts took place between those bulls that were kept there for artificial breeding purposes?

The CHAIRMAN: I think probably these questions had better be asked of Dr. Childs.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: All right.

The WITNESS: All I know is what is in the records, and those records were produced yesterday and I believe they have been circulated.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Just what is that record with regard to these bulls?—A. These premises were visited on January 31, according to the data I see on this list; 10 bulls were inspected and several exhibited symptoms and lesions of stomatitis.

Q. That is the item "Dominion Livestock Division, Regina, January 31"?—A. That is right.

Q. And it says: "Visited premises inspected 10 bulls several exhibiting symptoms and lesions of stomatitis. Man in charge instructed as to treatment and premises quarantined. On inspections Feb. 4 through Feb. 9th found bulls slowly recovering. Four animals have symptoms of foot rot and are being treated by being placed in a foot bath containing warm water with Izol disinfectant for 1 hour each day. Vesicles in mouths are healing and animals are starting to feed better each day. Subsequent visits disclose that several of these animals developed very sore and swollen fetlocks and in the coronary region and were quite lame. It appears that animals had been suffering from foot rot since last fall. Disinfectant treatment hastened recovery."—A. That is right.

Q. And those animals were destroyed?—A. Yes, on March 2.

Q. Now, my question is this: during the month of December is it not a fact that there were distributions of semen from these animals to various parts of the country?—A. There will be a record of that distribution but I have not got it here.

Q. But that could be produced?—A. Yes, from the records of the Livestock branch. These records which we have are veterinary records only.

Q. In the distribution of this semen, which was distributed during the period of November, December, and in January, if these animals were suffering from foot and mouth disease, would there or would there not be any danger from the distribution of semen from those animals infecting others?—A. That is a veterinary question and I would not attempt to answer it.

Q. I see.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anderson.

By Mr. Anderson:

Q. I wonder if I might ask a question? What about Indian Brahma bulls being brought into Saskatchewan?—A. There are Brahma bulls in southern Alberta. I have very little knowledge of the situation, but I believe they were brought to southern Alberta some years ago probably from Texas. But I have very little knowledge of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no other questions—

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Dr. Taggart, has any consideration been given in the department to merging, or placing under one head, the Department of Pathology and the Contagious Disease Branch, and in your opinion would that result in closer cooperation between those branches?—A. That has been considered, Mr. Chairman; it was, in fact, the case prior to 1937 and 1938, when the present structure was set up. But the decision was then made and it has since seemed to be a sound decision, to bring the research services under one administration, and the enforcement and regulatory services under another. That condition prevails throughout the Department of Agriculture and I might say throughout other departments of government as well. You must decide on one form or other of organization in a particular situation and in this case these services have been grouped according to function. They both belong to the Department of Agriculture and there is no reason at all why there should not be complete cooperation among the branches or divisions, as the case may be.

Q. Would it be your opinion that if they had been under one head there would have been any different result in regard to this foot and mouth disease, or are you satisfied that there was the fullest co-operation between these departments in respect to this outbreak?—A. I have no knowledge whatever of any lack of co-operation between these two groups, and I have been in a position to see it, if it were true.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. With respect to the bulls which were referred to by the member for Lake Centre, were any of those bulls recently imported?—A. I cannot answer that question. My opinion would be that they were not imported bulls; but I cannot answer it for sure. We can find out the identity and the description of those bulls if anybody would like to have it.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. On the same question, would the deputy minister mind getting us information as to the number of shipments of this semen and the dates during the months of this year, following the 1st of January?—A. I think that could be produced. I do not know the nature of the records they keep, but we can examine the records.

Q. I think that your officials would have the records and could get us the numbers and the places they were shipped to, and the dates following the 1st of January of this year.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. May I speak on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman? I was called out for a long distance telephone call from British Columbia from people representing 90,000 or 100,000 head of cattle who are very much alarmed about this. I think the minister is still here. They telephoned me just now and they

said that a wire was sent to Dr. Taggart today, from these gentlemen, and that there will be another one sent this afternoon. They were given to understand in the province of British Columbia when they lifted the embargo that any cattle shipped in from Alberta or elsewhere—I must leave Saskatchewan out of the picture right now—would be for immediate slaughter. That was the only reason the embargo was lifted.

At the present time I am informed that a carload has been shipped in including feeder stock, and 2 carloads of it were shipped to Chilliwack, which is in the Fraser Valley, and were turned out to pasture within the last 48 hours. The minister can swallow those 90 to 100,000 cattle; and we know that the British Columbia veterinaries were pulled out of there and sent to the prairie provinces; and unless there is a fulfillment of the agreement—as I said, my message will be confirmed by wire to-night, the phone call which I got over long distance is to be confirmed by wire to-night—and unless this agreement which was entered into by yourself on behalf of the department is enforced, then the embargo in British Columbia will go on again tomorrow morning. That is how serious we think it is in British Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we have Dr. Childs now? Is that agreeable to the committee?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No. I think I am entitled to speak for the cattle growers of 90 to 100,000 head in the province of British Columbia which includes the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and how serious they think this is at this hour in the province of British Columbia; and I am informed, although I may be incorrectly informed over the telephone, but it will be confirmed by wire to-night, that this has gone to the deputy minister by wire within the last 24 hours. I want to know now what steps are being taken to fulfill that agreement in order that I may contact the Minister of Agriculture for the province of British Columbia within the next ten minutes.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Might I attempt to answer the question. One of the reasons why the matter has not been dealt with up to the moment is because we are sitting here. We cannot be in two places at one time. I am not complaining about that at all but that wire came in just as we were coming into this room, and just as soon as we get out of this room we will be dealing with it again. It is not a matter between the deputy and the minister, it is a matter between the minister and myself. If the arrangements entered into are not being strictly carried out they certainly will be carried out from the time we find there has been a break—if there has been a break. That will be looked into immediately and I will get in touch with the minister as soon as I leave this room.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I have a further question.

As I say I have heard about telephone messages here and other memos but it is my explicit instruction to be confirmed by wire tonight and air mail tomorrow, it is my understanding over the telephone—I was called out of this meeting by my secretary five minutes ago—that two carloads were turned out to pasture in Chilliwack. I want to know now, and surely the minister has got authority to tell me now, that no further cattle will be sent into the Fraser Valley or the province of British Columbia to be turned out to feed. Surely the minister has authority to say that?

This agreement, I am informed, was entered into in good faith by Mr. Bowman with your department. It was that cattle would only be shipped in for immediate slaughter, but they have been shipped to feeder pasture.

I want to know, and I want the press to know about this. Surely somebody has the authority to say there will not be one more head of cattle shipped in there to be turned out as feeder stock—until such time as the province of British Columbia agrees to it?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I can give the honourable that assurance now—there won't be any cattle shipped in there to be turned out to pasture without the consent of the minister of the province of British Columbia. That was my understanding at the beginning.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And it was his.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It was only cattle going in for slaughter, cattle from Alberta, that were to go into British Columbia. I will find out whether there have been any go in as you say.

It may be due to the fact that at the time the understanding was given it was impossible to take under the regulations for quarantine cattle at any packing plant or any stockyards. When they went in they went in for slaughter. It did not matter whether it was at Calgary, Vancouver, Winnipeg, or where it was.

We had very strong pressure put on us by everyone in Alberta to have that restriction lifted in so far as certain packing houses in Alberta were concerned. The lifting of it may have resulted in this very thing happening because anybody can go to any stockyards in Alberta, buy cattle, and take them out.

That was done because the farmers in Alberta—feeders and others—were insisting on it being done. This has all been in the press—the correspondence back and forth. The wires were published in the press before we made the decision. We finally made the decision which made it possible for that to happen. That was done on the wish of the people there rather than here—and if some cattle got out of those yards and were taken to British Columbia it is something we can check on.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Would the minister say what power he has under the law to carry into effect a proposition such as he has just enunciated? What power do you have under the law?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Under the law?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is your authority?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Under the law I do not suppose we have any power, but we have had meetings of the provincial ministers of agriculture here and we have entered into certain understandings with them. So far as they have raised embargoes we have been able to carry out the understandings up to now.

Perhaps I should not say we have not any power—maybe we have power, but I know that it would take us at least three or four months to establish the fact that we have or have not the power and we cannot wait three or four months.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARKNESS: You do not need to worry about those Alberta cattle, Mr. Cruickshank, they are clean anyway.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, well, I want to know.

Mr. CHARLTON: I would like to ask the minister one question on the subject. Are there any live cattle coming east of Fort William into Ontario—any live cattle coming east of Winnipeg?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: As far as I know there are none coming east of Winnipeg.

Mr. CHARLTON: I would like to be sure?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am sure of it—but I cannot make you any more sure than I am sure.

Mr. CHARLTON: You do not “think”, you are sure, are you?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am satisfied there are not.

Mr. CHARLTON: How come they went into B.C. but cannot come east?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: One of the reasons they are not coming past Winnipeg is that we put an embargo against them coming past Winnipeg as part of the quarantine to begin with.

Our difficulty with Manitoba is that they will not slaughter anything that comes into Manitoba from farther west, so there is no place to slaughter cattle from the eastern part of Saskatchewan—and they cannot be slaughtered. Those people there are in the worst condition of anybody in Canada and they are making less noise about it. There is no place they can get their cattle slaughtered because we have not sufficient water in towns like Yorkton and Melville to make it possible to slaughter them there. They have to ship them back to Regina or Edmonton.

As far as cattle coming down to Winnipeg are concerned when they get there they must be slaughtered, but so far Manitoba will not even permit us to send them there for slaughter. The only cattle slaughtered there are Manitoba cattle. I do not think there are any cattle other than Manitoba cattle being slaughtered in Manitoba.

We are trying to get that settled; and British Columbia had a similar regulation at one time but they have taken it off after discussion with us. Now my friend suggests to me that they might put it back on and if they do that it will be because of some misunderstandings—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I want to correct the minister and he should not put words in my mouth. I said if any more are permitted into British Columbia for fattening, you will get a wire this afternoon cancelling the agreement.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, we have some wires this afternoon that I have not seen. I will see them as soon as I get out of here.

Mr. ARGUE: I would like to ask the minister this: Are these arrangements you have with the province of British Columbia and other provinces in writing or are they just verbal agreements you have with the agriculture ministers?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There are telegrams, there are letters, and there have been discussions of one kind and another with regard to the trading in livestock. Some of them were discussions here at the conference.

Mr. SINNOTT: Before we rise, we are dealing with something now that should be expedited as quickly as possible for two reasons: first, to stamp out the disease, and second, we have the officials here. Would it be possible to sit tomorrow morning?

Some MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to ask the minister one question. With regard to the embargo in Manitoba is it a fact that their embargo is maintained because of the dominion embargo on any stock going through Winnipeg?

Mr. ROSS: Would you repeat that?

Mr. WRIGHT: Is the present embargo that is in force by the Manitoba government the result of the embargo which the dominion government has put on stock coming through Winnipeg, and would the Manitoba government be prepared to change their attitude if that embargo were lifted?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am speaking now from memory. The records can perhaps be obtained to indicate exactly what the position is but the Manitoba embargo, as I remember it, is to the effect that none of the animals coming in there are to be slaughtered in the Winnipeg plant. They say that if you can find a way to get around the Winnipeg plant and send the animals on further they are not going to complain about it; but they do insist on having a certain amount of meat go out of Winnipeg or out of the St. Boniface plant to the east before permitting cattle other than Manitoba cattle to be slaughtered in the St. Boniface plant.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, it is six o'clock. What is your pleasure with respect to meeting tonight at 8?

Mr. SINNOTT: I move that resolution. I know it is important and if the others do not agree it is all right with me, but we are down here to do a job and I do not care if we sit all day tomorrow and all day Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by Mr. Sinnott that we meet at 8 o'clock this evening.

Mr. HARKNESS: He did not move that at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, am I wrong?

Mr. SINNOTT: I did not know you were coming back tonight but I will move that we come back at 8 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to ask the committee's opinion about coming back tonight and I understand that you would so move?

Mr. SINNOTT: And tomorrow afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we will take the evening and then decide about tomorrow. You are moving that we meet again tonight. All those in favour? Carried.

We will adjourn until 8 o'clock tonight.

EVENING SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please, gentlemen. Mr. Hetland has the floor.

Dr. Thomas Childs, Veterinary Director General, called:

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Dr. Childs a question that I asked Mr. Taggart. Now, there is a lot of bone meal being sold in the west, meat meal and meat scraps. Is there any danger of spreading the disease through that source?—A. Very little danger, sir. Bones that are converted into bone meal, meat meal and so on, are all cooked, either in pressure tanks or in what they call melters, cooked under seal to make them sterile, so there is no danger from that source of spreading the disease.

Q. What about crows eating certain refuse or something. Is there any danger of crows carrying this disease in their feet from one farm to the other?—A. There might be some little danger, mechanical carriers, but I recall when the outbreak in Mexico commenced I was very concerned about the migratory birds moving from the south to the north—we know they go down to Mexico and feed during the winter season. So I consulted with the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, with the chief, Dr. Simms, on this, and he informed me in writing that during their outbreak in California in 1929, at the coast—that outbreak by the way was started from raw meats or scraps coming in on a South American ship and being distributed in the raw state to hogs. Anyway, he informed me that there were thousands and thousands of gulls around those parts at that time when they had that outbreak, and they had no evidence of the gulls ever spreading this disease although they were all over the place, though I think they could, as mechanical carriers, and that seems reasonable. They would have to carry the virus, but they would not carry it far because it would be diluted in water and washed off. I do not think the danger from that source would be too great.

Q. I was going to ask you the question, how long could cattle go along in a herd without catching the disease if some cattle in that herd had been cured?

For instance, say in a pasture. I suppose that would be a certain amount of guesswork?—A. It would be a guess, yes. To start with, they would have to come in contact with the live virus.

Q. But you were saying that that virus dies after a certain length of time in an animal?—A. Yes, I believe that, but animals can be carriers, of course.

Q. It still could be alive?—A. Yes, it might, as I mentioned last night. There might be some little abscess formation due to secondary infection. The virus might be held in that lesion and a breakdown might occur at some future time and might allow the virus to escape.

Q. Within 11 months or so?—A. Probably before that, in most cases.

Q. Then there was some suggestion about the case at Ormiston. I think that was traced to a bone being thrown out in a yard?—A. That is the information.

Q. Now, don't you think, Dr. Childs, that it would be a good idea, after possibly you have taken all these precautions, to advise people who buy meat from any source for any purpose, if they would boil or cook all bones that have come with that carcass?—A. Yes, that has already been done, sir.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Dr. Childs, in the file tabled yesterday, which came into my possession today, on the first page it states that a report was made to you from Regina. It states: ". . . However, realizing the danger of relying on a field diagnosis in a disease of a vesicular nature such as this it was decided to contact Dr. Childs, Veterinary Director General for further direction and advice. Following this phone call Dr. N. V. James was detailed to quarantine the premises . . ." That has reference to the Waas premises. You apparently gave some instructions by phone as a result of this call. Have you any memorandum of those instructions, or were they confirmed by a letter later on?—A. I am certain if they were, instructions were sent for sure. I am not certain just whether that was confirmed by memorandum or not.

Q. That is, there were written instructions that went out as a result of that phone call?—A. Yes, I believe they went in the form of a telegram, if my memory is correct.

Q. We will check that later.—A. I am not sure, I am just speaking from memory now.

Q. As a result of those instructions, apparently two horses were vaccinated on the Waas farm on the 2nd December?—A. I think you are wrong there. If I might correct you, I think it was on the 3rd.

Q. Either the 2nd or the 3rd, two horses were vaccinated there. December 3 is right. Did you give instructions for the vaccination of those horses?—A. I believe I did.

Q. Why did you give those instructions for the vaccination?—A. To establish whether it was dangerous or not.

Q. What were you suspicious of when you gave instructions? In other words, what would this vaccination determine?—A. It is not vaccination, inoculation.

Q. I am not familiar with these technical terms.—A. That was to establish as evidence that it was not more serious than stomatitis as was so diagnosed.

Q. What other disease than foot and mouth disease would this inoculation determine?—A. Vesicular diseases, vesicular stomatitis.

Q. The vaccination of a horse would determine whether it was vesicular stomatitis or a more dangerous virus disease?—A. That is what we hoped for. You will understand in many of these cases you do not get the results you hope for sometimes.

Q. No, but there was some suspicion in your mind, I presume, when you asked that the inoculation be made, that this might be foot and mouth disease?—A. No, I would not say that—just as a matter of precaution as support for the clinical diagnosis our men had made.

Q. Well, is there any other disease that this would indicate, other than foot and mouth disease. I understood—maybe I am wrong, I am not a medical man—but I understood that when you inoculate a horse you do it for the purpose of determining whether this is actually vesicular stomatitis or a more dangerous virus disease?—A. Surely.

Q. And that more dangerous virus disease is foot and mouth disease. There is no other more dangerous virus disease than vesicular stomatitis for which this test would be a proof other than foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes, there is.

Q. What other disease?—A. There is a more dangerous virus than foot and mouth disease, namely, rinderpest. It was to support the clinical diagnosis of Drs. Carlson and Hunter and James that they were dealing with vesicular stomatitis.

Q. And not a more dangerous virus?—A. Yes.

Q. What is a more dangerous virus disease other than foot and mouth disease?—A. Rinderpest.

Q. I am trying to determine whether this test on the horses at the Waas premises was made for the purpose of actually determining whether it was foot and mouth disease or not.—A. The test was made to support the clinical diagnosis of James, Hunter and Carlson, which, if test was positive would indicate it would support clinical diagnosis that we did not have foot and mouth disease. Does that answer you?

Q. Yes, that is what I expected that was for. Unfortunately, the horses showed lesions.—A. Unfortunately, yes.

Q. And as a result of that, your fears were naturally allayed.—A. That would be correct.

Q. Were there any other horses on the Waas farm?—A. I am not certain. I have not looked into that.

Q. Well, the report here says five horses.—A. There is a piece at the bottom of that form giving a space for other species.

Q. It says here five horses.—A. Then five it was.

Q. And none of the other horses showed any symptoms, either then or later, except the two that were inoculated?—A. That is correct.

Q. There were two people who came to the Waas farm, one of whom was Mr. Woods, and his herd became infected some ten days later, I think about the 11th or 12th, according to the record here, and you then made another test with a horse on the Woods farm according to the record. That horse did not show any lesions. That is correct? According to the report here?—A. I believe that is so, yes.

Q. Would it not indicate anything to you, with a horse showing lesions that there might be a suspicion? I would take it from the first report on the Waas farm that had these 2 horses not shown lesions, you might have made some further tests?—A. That would be correct.

Q. That would be a correct assumption; and you would probably have carried out more complete tests. Now, on the 12th when these horses on the Woods farm failed to react to the inoculation, why did you not then order a more thorough examination?—A. It would seem that was the place to do it, but we already had considered that we were dealing with vesicular stomatitis, and that could have been a miss; it does not always work out one hundred per cent in all these inoculations, and injections, of any kind. For instance, to digress for a moment, to make clearer what I mean: on the 18th of February I started animal inoculations at Regina on the legislative grounds in an unused barn which was well isolated. The animals were brought in from 20 miles

or more outside. There were 2 cattle, young cattle, one just short of a year and one maybe a little older; and 2 pigs about 3 or 4, or 3½ to 4 months, maybe a little more, but they were about 85 to 90 pound pigs and we had fresh material collected and harvested from lesions from one of the infected premises, I do not recall at the moment which premises it was; but my instructions were to harvest fresh material and get it right from the vesicles, if possible. He did that by using a syringe, which is the proper way to take it, provided they can find a vesicle which has not burst. We would use a sterile syringe, and the fluid would be withdrawn, and we would get a good sample.

Well, I personally supervised those animals myself, with respect to this inoculation. We used an intra-muscular inoculation, not on the tongue, and there was a good reason for that. I was not, however, able to stay for the full observation of these animals, but just to show you how these things will go, to indicate how they will go, none of those animals came down in the time I was there, the remaining 2 days. I looked at them twice a day myself, and others did too; and one of them came down only 7 days later, you see, one of the cattle.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not like to interrupt a private conversation you are having with Mr. Wright, but we would like to hear some of this down here.

The WITNESS: Am I not speaking loudly enough?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No. I cannot hear a word.

The WITNESS: My goodness! I wish you had checked me up sooner. Shall I repeat it?

The CHAIRMAN: No. Carry on.

The WITNESS: That test indicates how these inoculations and injections will go; they are not always 100 per cent. Undoubtedly the virus was there; there may have been vesicular stomatitis along with it, and the presence of it might have inhibited the action of the foot and mouth disease virus. I do not know that, but it might have. But that was the way it turned out; and none of the others developed at all, either the 2 pigs or the other cattle beast showed any symptoms; and it was 7 days before this one showed symptoms, and I saw that syringe, and the needle put into the muscles, and I saw the fluid go in.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. When were the hogs inoculated?—A. I think at that time I marked it down; it was about 6:30 on the evening of the 18th of February.

Q. There was no hogs inoculated before that?—A. No, not as far as I know.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. In other words, there is more than one method of making tests than just using the horse alone?—A. Oh yes, there are a good many more methods.

Q. And more thorough methods were not used until the 18th of February or the 15th of February?—A. That is correct.

Q. When the tests were made?—A. That is correct.

Q. You have indicated that the original tests were made to determine whether it was a more dangerous disease than vesicular stomatitis, and the more dangerous disease being foot and mouth disease. I can well appreciate the fact that when the horse reacted in the first place you would be thrown off the trail and perhaps not feel justified in making a more thorough investigation. But when on the second trial the horse did not react, and when this is a disease which is primarily a horse disease, which a horse will take quite readily, I can scarcely credit that there was not some neglect of a more thorough

test, after the Woods horse failed to react after the inoculation. However, that is all gone and past. On February 11 you stated that you took your leave?—A. I commenced my statutory leave, that is right.

Q. And you stated that on that date you consulted your superior or senior officers before you took your leave?—A. That is a regular procedure, always, yes.

Q. Who was the senior officer whom you consulted?—A. That would be Mr. Young, Director of the Production Service.

Q. Was there any discussion with Mr. Young or anyone else before you took your leave with regard to this outbreak in Saskatchewan?—A. No, no; there was not.

Q. Mr. Young had known about that outbreak in Saskatchewan before you took your leave?—A. Yes, I would say so; and of course at that time we did not think we had anything there more than stomatitis, or I certainly would not have taken my leave; I would have been out there long before that.

Q. On February 11 there already had been the second outbreak, if we may call it that; the first one took place in November or in the early part of December; and then there was a fresh outbreak; but apparently there was not much of a spread of the disease. Apparently it had been spreading, but nobody notified you of it.—A. In some cases, that is true, such as the Hanley herd.

Q. Then again, there was a fresh outbreak which took place around February the 1st or 2nd, when more herds were being infected, and they reported it by February 12, I believe, and another horse was tested on the farm of K. Haun.—A. Yes.

Q. On February 12; did that horse react to the virus?—A. No, I do not believe it did; there is no record of its reacting.

The CHAIRMAN: You may have one more minute, Mr. Wright.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Well, apparently this second outbreak had actually taken place and was in process of being investigated when you took your leave on February 11. At any time during the outbreak did you consult with the Pathological Department with regard to whether the inoculation of a horse was all that should be done, or whether there might be any further tests made that might determine more accurately what the disease was?—A. No, I do not recall consulting with the Pathological division at that time.

Q. Would they have more knowledge along those lines than your department did?—A. They would have more knowledge in conducting laboratory tests, for sure, oh yes.

Q. Yes, but at the same time they would have more knowledge of conducting tests and this whole disease having been spreading, there might have been some consultation with the Pathological department with respect to tests; but of course that is just a layman's idea.—A. It is a point well taken, I would say. They are specialists in their field; that is their work, that is one line of their work. I have a couple of dozen different lines of work, of course.

Q. That is why I asked the minister or the deputy minister whether there was full co-operation between the two departments?—A. I can assure you, sir, there is most cordial relations between myself and the director of the laboratory. I consider him to be one of my best friends.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Quelch and then Mr. Hetland.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. I would like to ask Dr. Childs if there is any form of inoculation or any other form of medical treatment that is considered to give to cattle to inoculate them against foot and mouth disease? I understand that a certain drug has been used in a number of countries, and might I ask how effective it might be?—A. Yes sir, there is a vaccine used in most countries of South America, that

is in the cattle raising countries, and in European countries such as Switzerland, Belgian, Holland and Germany. I am not certain, but I think they use vaccines in Denmark as well: I am not sure that they use them in Norway although all these countries have had their outbreaks of foot and mouth disease and during the past six months or so it has really reached perhaps you might say a pandemic over there, a real scourge. This little break we have here is very small; I am not minimizing what the effects will be; we know that long before it ever appeared; but these vaccines are used freely in European countries. The result of course is that the disease has never been cleaned out. Of course, their geographical situations are such that unless they all not together and cleaned it out, none of them could remain free very long, you understand; they are so closely connected geographically and there is so much international movement back and forth; but they do use these vaccines. They were used freely in Mexico during this outbreak in Mexico. They started off by slaughtering cattle, and with radical methods as we are doing here; but they met a great deal of opposition and they found that diseased animals were not being reported, but were being hidden, and so on; and in fact, some of the people were actually shot by the natives down there for coming and looking over the cattle and destroying them as they thought for nothing.

Vaccines were used down there; but the best they could secure—and they produced those vaccines in a new laboratory which was set up in the vicinity of Mexico City—I was not down there myself; but the best they could say of the vaccines which were used down there—and they had the best of laboratories and workers they could get to produce those vaccines—they could only say that they gave a relative immunity, a fair degree of protection for a matter of four months; they could not trust them beyond that. Any massive exposure would break them down. Of course, in an attack of foot-and-mouth disease and the recovery of an animal from that, to the best of our knowledge and according to the best research workers, the immunity is not good for more than a year from a natural infection.

They are using vaccines freely over in Holland; in fact they pioneered there in producing vaccines. Now, it was a very expensive procedure, making these vaccines because it meant sacrificing an animal to inoculate it and recover the virus from the infected animal, so it was expensive procedure and there would not be so many doses of vaccine secured from the one animal, which was slaughtered to harvest material for vaccine.

Q. Could it be secured from an animal which had it and recovered, or would there be disease in that case?—A. They had to inoculate the animal with the virus and grow the virus in the animal. That is the source of the vaccine.

However, within the past three years—I think in the summer of 1949—in Europe, in Holland, a worker there, Dr. Frenkel, a scientist, developed a method of producing vaccine in larger quantities and more cheaply by setting up his laboratory in an abattoir. As cattle were slaughtered he secured fresh tongues and he went to considerable work and pains to develop equipment to strip the mucuous membrane from the tongues, sort of shave it off, macerate it, and inoculate it with the virus, growing the virus in a laboratory instead of growing it in the animal. He grew it in this animal tissue. I believe he has had considerable success with that. But that vaccine, although it can be made in quantity and cheaper, much cheaper, is only protective for a certain length of time. It does not give lifelong immunity. They must go back and inoculate again for protective immunization.

In Switzerland they have been using vaccine for years. Of course, that is a very well ordered country and it is not so accessible for commercial movement of livestock or people either. They can look after their boundaries a little better than most European countries.

They have been able to keep the disease pretty well under control by restricting the inward movement of susceptible animals, by strict quarantine, and by use of their own vaccine. They have been fairly successful.

However, vaccine does not confer lifelong protection and, strange to say, these countries doing the most with vaccines, supposed to have top flight scientists of the world handling these things, are the countries that have the most foot-and-mouth disease today.

Britain, of course, is situated in a very bad spot geographically, it is regrettable to say. You have the continent there within close range. There is a great deal of tourist traffic and, of course, there is a great deal of bird life moving from the continent to Britain. They, of course, blame it on the birds. They have had more outbreaks in the past year than during any of the recent years.

I believe there have been 29 different outbreaks within the last few weeks according to the most recent information I have,—and we get this information from over there as soon as an outbreak occurs. We know about it because they cable us right away. They have had two outbreaks in Scotland just in the last few days and Scotland has been comparatively free of this.

Mr. SINNOTT: I think we are getting far away from the point we are after.

Mr. JUTRAS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the doctor is trying to answer Mr. Quelch's question.

Mr. QUELCH: I want to follow it up with another one.

The WITNESS: I will finish in just a moment. I just wanted to give you a word picture of how vaccines are produced and their values.

During the last few days or a week there have been two outbreaks in Scotland. One occurred in the northeast over in Aberdeenshire and the other I have not had time to pinpoint on the map. I do not know just where it is.

Of course, in addition to the birds Britain has been for many years getting supplies of chilled and frozen meat from South America where the disease is endemic. My information was, when I was over there, that outbreaks usually occurred in pigs on the premises first—from scraps of infected meat and meat juices fed uncooked in swill.

It is into pigs first and cattle next.

Have I answered your question about vaccines?

Mr. QUELCH: Yes, but I cannot see why the member for Springfield says this is not relevant. As a cattle raiser I think it is important to have these vaccines and inoculations, in order to make the animals immune from the danger of foot and mouth disease. I would also not consider the fact that it was effective for three or four months to be a deterrent because there are other vaccines which are only effective for a short period of time. I am not sure of the name but last year we had an outbreak of hemorrhagical septicemia in our district. The veterinarian inoculated for it and he said it was effective for four months. It is quite expensive but he thought it worthwhile. I may be wrong in the name but he described it as a form of pneumonia. The animals slobbered and became stiff but they were cured after a while.

Is it possible to secure the vaccine in this country, and if not how long would it take to manufacture it? Would it not be possible to produce it in conjunction with packing plants where they could get the tongues or some other cheap method, and would you not consider any rancher who has valuable cattle well advised to go to the expense of vaccinating in order to try to save his cattle from infection?

The WITNESS: No, I would not consider it advisable.

Mr. QUELCH: Why? Is it too expensive?

The WITNESS: Well, you may be masking the infection and holding it in there.

There is another feature to it too. It would be very, very dangerous to have the virus around anywhere in the country to produce the vaccine. I would like to point out, if you have the patience, why that is so.

When the outbreak occurred in Mexico there was a hue and cry for vaccine in the United States and for them to do this and that.

The CHAIRMAN: A little louder.

The WITNESS: Have I not enough power yet?

The CHAIRMAN: No, speak up.

The WITNESS: There was a great cry for vaccine for protection. There was a bill introduced into Congress for a matter of \$30 million to provide facilities for studying the virus of foot and mouth disease alone. The United States would not have it anywhere on the continent—absolutely refused to permit it. The simple reason was that it would be harbouring the virus and they could not be sure that the virus would not escape.

They made arrangements to take over an island called Prudence Island—just south of Rhode Island—to build facilities there. I understand there was about four miles of water between the island and mainland. That was tentatively agreed to and this appropriation of \$30 million, I believe it was, was for the construction of the facilities. That has never been done. Sentiment is altogether against having the virus on the continent at all for fear that it will escape. If it ever escaped and you started vaccine, it is my opinion and it is the opinion of others who are much better versed in this than I—although I have given it a lot of study, believe me—that you would be living with the disease the first think you knew.

Our outbreak here is rather minor. It looks gib and the repercussions are terrific—and nobody knows that better than myself. It is quite possible that most of you gentlemen here have never given foot and mouth disease much consideration until this outbreak occurred. That is quite likely, but I, and others such as I, have given it a lot of consideration.

Have I answered the question, sir?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hetland is next.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. I just want to ask you a question, Dr. Childs. Is it possible for an animal to have stomatitis and still have foot and mouth disease at the same time?—A. I believe it would be possible for both viruses to be present at the same time. I have no reason to think they could not be present because the animal is susceptible to both.

Q. That leads me to another question. Would it be possible when you are examining an animal to pinpoint the stomatitis and still miss the foot and mouth disease?—A. It might if you confined your tests perhaps to one or two animals. In cases like that you would need to go over a wider field. Also, in very recent times there has been a serum developed that will help indicate what is present.

Of course, in dealing with a thing such as foot and mouth disease I will admit that every known test should be employed until you are certain about it. As I have mentioned before here, if we had the foresight as we have the hindsight we probably would have gone after it—we know we would have gone after it much more quickly than we did.

Q. Dr. Childs, you know of course that last year there was a lot of spoiled feed in the country—hay and low grade grain. Would that have a tendency to put you off too while you were testing those cases?—A. Yes, possibly; because in certain parts of the country, particularly the west, we

inquired into that and veterinarians had reported trouble from feed spoilage, mouldy feed and such like. There is no doubt that that condition was present.

Q. Another point and I am through. Where does stomatitis come from? Is that caught from another animal or some place that we do not know? Where does it come from? Is it caused through feed or something?—A. No, I would not say that feed causes it. The virus must be present. We do not know where it might come from—we do not know all about these things. Even the research workers who are putting in full time study on these matters do not know all about it. They do not know where it comes from.

There must always be some kind of a carrier to bring it in contact with a suitable host. The virus may live in nature, in things we do not know about, or that I certainly do not know about—or in other animals. There may be animals that normally carry the virus but never show the disease—but they may be carriers just the same.

Q. They must have caught it from some other animal at some time?—A. Or it might be from a mechanical carrier by indirect contact.

Q. Would it not be something like the tuberculosis germ?—A. No, a virus is a quite different thing from tuberculosis bacteria.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Argue, then Mr. Cruickshank.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Dr. Childs, you do think differently now with hindsight, as you term it. With regard to your tests, what different tests would you make, and what different things would you do?—A. What different things would I do?

Q. Yes.—A. Well, if I had thought for a moment that we had foot and mouth disease, as I said, I would have been out for everything we did and we would have made field tests through the whole species of animals to make sure—sheep, swine, young cattle and a couple of horses. Someone might say why don't you have guinea pigs and you also ought to make the egg test. I do not think we would have gone to those things.

Q. I think it was agreed that if the species of animals you mentioned had been inoculated early in December the country certainly would not be in the mess it is in now. I believe that is correct?—A. Might I interrupt?

Mr. STEWART: You are making an assertion, that is not a question.

Mr. ARGUE: O.K., that is my opinion.

The WITNESS: You say if we had done this in the first of December the country would not have been in the mess it is today?

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Yes, early in December.—A. There is another way of looking at that and if you will look over the reports you will see the diagnosis of stomatitis was made December 2nd. Calves from the Waas herd were taken to Burns premises—they were taken down to the Burns' premises the 22nd of November, and the infection was taken to the Hanley herd on the 27th or 29 of November. That was a week or 10 days before it was even reported to the officials infection had been taken to the Burns' premises and to the Hanley herd ten days and over two months respectively before our boys knew about it, they did not know about the Hanley herd, until the 19th of February. It was never reported to anybody that it was there. That is where the start was from. Of course, we grant you that if we had suspected that it was foot and mouth disease at that time we would have done these tests instead of what we did; but it never occurred to anybody that it could be possible, we did not expect it at all or the possibility of its being the serious disease it was. We did not expect it was sabotage, we did not think it was sabotage

at all, we had no reason for thinking that. Had we suspected it was what it turned out to be we would certainly have made more tests; but we would have still had to catch up with unreported infection, implanted in the Hanley herd November 27 and the infection, in that group around the Hanley premises and we would need to have caught up with some stock that was sold from there. We would have still have had to catch up with it. But I may tell you here that the economic repercussions would have been identically the same as they are. That is not trying to excuse anything or help us out; because regardless of whether the disease is stopped in the first animal that is infected—and that is all that is reported, we must report these things, we can't hide them—the next day the United States would have applied the embargo; and that was just along the line of what happened.

Q. Of course if you had known that it was foot and mouth disease early I think your action at the Burns' plant would have been a great deal different; there would not have been carcasses with the head of it condemned and the rest of it approved for human consumption. You would have done differently in that respect?—A. Oh, undoubtedly the plant would have been closed that much sooner.

Q. Yes, and you mentioned that there might have been sabotage; what do you mean by that? Was somebody not obeying your regulations?—A. No, I didn't mean that. I believe the virus did get in unintentionally, innocently. We have no reason to think otherwise.

Q. Yes. I am inclined to agree with you there. I asked Dr. Taggart a question this afternoon and he referred me to you. Is there any possibility that any of the carcasses that showed the disease and most of which were approved for consumption went to parts other than Saskatchewan points? Was there any way of identifying that to find out whether these carcasses had gone out? Would that be on some of the forms that are listed here?—A. We have no record of what went out of the Burns' plant. We haven't that record.

Q. Yes.—A. If you don't mind we will deal with that later on when the gentleman who looks after that end of the work is here. But I would mention here that as soon as we did put a quarantine on the Burns' plant nothing went out after that in the line of meat, and all the meat in there that was suspected of carrying that disease we seized and treated just the same as the infected animals, it was put in the hole with them.

Q. What was the date of the quarantine you mentioned, that last one?—A. Burns?

Q. Yes.—A. You mean on the cattle.

Q. You said something about shipments going out of that plant?—A. That is on the 18th, you mean?

Q. But on the shipments that went out of that plant before the 18th is there any possible way of knowing whether or not some diseased carcasses, parts of those carcasses, were shipped to points such as Montreal or Vancouver?—A. Yes, some may have gone out.

Q. There may have been some?—A. Yes. We did all we could to guard against that. Now, sometime within the past day or so, I have made mention that with the organization we had in the country, with our observer reporting service we got reports on the situation. One of the first things I did when we decided that we had to do something—I may tell you that I was satisfied in my own mind on the 17th, after the look I had around in Regina that it was foot and mouth disease. I have seen this disease years ago. I promptly placed a quarantine—I might as well explain to you what I did, we took all the safeguards we could. One of the first things done was to close the Burns' plant, and that other plant, the other little plant, the Inter-Continental, and close them up, although there was never any infection in there a quarantine was put into effect.

Q. This is on the 18th of February?—A. On the 18th of February. I might tell you, gentlemen, I was very busy a day or two—and nights, also—I did not get much sleep at that time. There was quite a lot to do, gentlemen. On the 18th we placed these quarantines in effect. This meant of course blocking off all the main avenues, all the avenues we could think of—and we thought of this long before—by which the disease might escape, by which the virus disease might escape from the infected area. Mind you, I was getting out on a limb here, I could not prove yet that it was foot and mouth disease; and that is something to do—as you might say, throwing a monkey wrench into the watch. As I say we quarantined these packing plants. Then, realizing of course that the movement of livestock was from west to east, and south, that Winnipeg was the bottleneck because they have to pass through there, I promptly had our district veterinarian at Winnipeg put a quarantine on the stockyards there and prohibit animals from leaving those stockyards; and of course that meant that they had to be slaughtered, go direct to slaughter. There was another reason also for doing that. On the 18th, after investigating things around and about we found that there had been a German immigrant here on the Waas farm, and he had to be found, and for that purpose we had the assistance of the mounted police to help us find the man. We then found that the man had left the Waas place; but as soon as I knew that I thought, well, what is going to happen next. So the thing to do was to trace him and we hoped he was still in the vicinity, but he was not. We found that he had gone over to McLean, Sask. and bought a bus ticket or ticket, and the ticket was purchased for Winnipeg; and all this time, too, there was the possibility that if he was a saboteur, or even a carrier of the virus, as he might do in his finger nails, things could get into a devil of a mess. We got his description from the immigration department, but that was of very little help to us. We found that he was a dairy worker, but the description was not very helpful. I thought, now the man is further down, working in some herd down around Winnipeg, in some dairy herd, and the devil knows what has gone wrong down there. So of course in addition to having this quarantine and prohibition put on immediately we of course alerted our chief veterinarian there to get every available man on it, everyone he could raise, and to inspect and look over these dairies and see if this man was around there; and the police also were on the trail down there, but he wasn't there. They had to trail him further, and that was done. And, of course, we put on a modified quarantine on all the packing plants and stockyards that might possibly be involved in order to prevent further movement of cattle from areas that might be infected; such as Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw; and, of course, the Regina stockyards were closed up tight.

Q. We have been very fortunate so far. Would you think the danger of any possible foot and mouth disease resulting from the shipment of meat from the Burns' plant to other parts of Canada is now over?—A. Yes, I feel fairly safe on that; I feel fairly safe.

Q. I have one other question.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You have more than your ten minutes.

Mr. ARGUE: I do not think I have. I have put a few questions and I think the questions are all very short and the answers have been very full and very informative.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Dr. Childs, you mentioned that an immigrant might have brought this disease to Canada, very likely, in an innocent way. We all know that Canada has been receiving thousands of immigrants from various European countries where foot and mouth disease is prevalent. Did you at time advise any depart-

ment of government to take steps to disinfect immigrants and their belongings coming into Canada before those steps were finally taken after the outbreak of disease?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question? I promise to be very brief. He answered no.

The WITNESS: I would like to elaborate on that.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN: The witness is just going to elaborate a little and then it will be your turn, Mr. Cruickshank.

The WITNESS: I will just be a moment.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: A moment?

The WITNESS: A minute, sir, we will say. We did not think of that because that method of disinfecting and fumigating immigrants' clothing and personal effects was not put into effect anywhere except during recent times at Iceland where they had a few bitter experiences, I believe. The United States never employed this method, and they, of course, have many more immigrants than we have. They do not, unless they have put it into force in this last week or so. But we can see the danger now with the speed of modern methods of transportation, and the terrific epidemic they have over there. But there is the tourist business, and the traveller, also, coming from those countries, although the farm workers would be the dangerous ones.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I promise to be very brief, Mr. Chairman, at the request of some members. I am going to speak a little slower than I usually speak. Someone says to speak louder. I have never been accused of not being loud enough. I am not going to rehash what has happened in the past, Mr. Chairman, unless I am provoked. I am not worried about the mistakes that have been made in the past, and plenty have been made. Now, it has been referred to immigration, and, my God, we have even put up with Newfoundlanders and so we can put up with some immigrants! I am being a little briefer than I promised, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to rehash the statements that have been made. I have expressed myself in those things, but that is not going to help the future. But I did ask a question from Dr. Childs yesterday, and I would like an answer. I asked a question yesterday, from January 1 to February 23 were any frozen or fresh cattle shipped to British Columbia and, if so, to which districts.

The WITNESS: I did not get that quite clearly, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I think I was loud enough. I asked this question yesterday, Mr. Chairman, which I think is plenty of notice. From January 1 to February 23, were any frozen or fresh cattle shipped to the province of British Columbia? I said frozen or live cattle—I beg your pardon—and if so, to which districts.

The WITNESS: We have no record of any such shipments, sir, except the one on January 25, that is the fancy stuff, the boneless stuff, that is the offal. We have no records of any shipments out there except that one of January 25. That is, that fancy meats and pork ribs.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Yes, and I also asked yesterday, Mr. Chairman, what that was because I, frankly, do not know myself and I could not get an answer from the deputy minister today. Apparently he did not know what "fancy" means. 6120 pounds. What does that mean? Now, the next item means pork ribs and I know something about that, Dr. Childs, because I buy them sometimes. What does that "fancy" mean, though?—A. That, in packing house language, means fancy meats, such as hearts, livers and such like. Certainly no bone.

Q. Yes, but from what animals?—A. They might be from beef or mutton.

Q. Or cattle?—A. Or cattle.

Q. Well, what were they from?—A. They would probably be mixed.

Q. Can you get that information for me, and also where they were distributed? I understood the witness this afternoon to say, and yesterday, that this disease could not spread from this fresh meat or bones. I want to know what "fancy" means there. It does not mean a thing to me, but you say it might be from cattle, it might be from mutton, it might be from pigs.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I hope it is not Saskatchewan horsemeat.

Mr. HARKNESS: That would be safe.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The only thing they tested was horses.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Where was it distributed in British Columbia? I asked this question yesterday. Surely with a staff—I do not want to delay the time, and I am watching the clock, I do not want to take up the time of the committee—but I asked for this information yesterday and surely with a staff it should be available. If it is not available tonight, when can I get it?—A. Well, I do not know as we can get that now, just where it was distributed—from the Burns packing plant in British Columbia I presume it would go to the consumers in the city of Vancouver, Westminster.

Q. Well, Mr. Chairman, as I understood, the statutes were read by Mr. Stewart yesterday, and I think if I am correct in what he said they are compelled by law, and I can be corrected if I am wrong, they are compelled by law to keep a record of the distribution of this. Am I not right in that?

Mr. STEWART: No, I read the provincial statutes. The provincial government can regulate them on that.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am presuming that the province of British Columbia is at least one step ahead of Saskatchewan and that we have that regulation there, too.

Mr. STEWART: They do not show any evidence of it.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Surely the records must be available, and they are available, surely, to your department. Quite frankly, what I am interested in knowing, Dr. Childs—I am not suggesting that there was any disease in this shipment, I do not know, I am a mere layman.

Mr. HETLAND: It could not have any disease. They are boneless.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Just a minute. Mr. Hetland has taken up 18 minutes tonight, so I think I am entitled to take up the rest of my time for my questioning, and I do not come from Saskatchewan. Surely your department can find out for me where the shipment went. I presume you are going to get this information for me.—A. We can try, of course. It went to Burns in Vancouver, but I would clarify this a little bit. Bones from infected animals are dangerous because the virus gets into the marrow, but meats that are boneless, that would be hearts, livers and so on, the changes that take place in that product will not permit the virus to live very long if the environment of the virus changes a little away from the exact state in which it ordinarily lives, either acid or alkaline, so that the meat that is ripened, or hung for a while, will not be dangerous on that account. This consignment I would not consider dangerous at all.

Q. No, but, Dr. Childs, the frozen meat shipped between January 1 and February 23, that frozen meat would be dangerous, would it not?—A. No, we did not ship any to Vancouver in that time except this one.

Q. The one shipment?—A. Yes, the one shipment.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cardiff has the floor. Then Mr. Sinnott.

Mr. BROWNE: Can I come after Mr. Sinnott, then, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

By Mr. Cardiff:

Q. This afternoon when Mr. Taggart was giving evidence, he admitted perhaps he was a little bit negligent in respect of reporting to the minister at a certain time. Would you, Dr. Childs, admit that you have been negligent at all in regard to the diagnosis of this disease in Saskatchewan?—A. No, I would not admit of having been negligent.

Q. You hold a very important position with respect to the livestock of Canada, do you not?—A. Yes, sir, which I appreciate.

Q. And it is you whom the veterinarians in this country look to for advice as to direction in regard to contagious diseases and the more important and dangerous kinds, is it not?—A. Yes, that is so.

Q. Well, would you tell me this. Why would it take you two months to decide whether you should take a test of this disease? Why would it take two months before you decided to take that test? Why would it take you two months to decide whether it was necessary to take a test?—A. I believe I have answered that question in various forms several times before. We did not think we were dealing with anything serious.

Q. You were dealing with what you thought was vesicular stomatitis?—A. Sure enough.

Q. Is that not similar to foot and mouth disease, very closely related to it?—A. It has some similarity.

Q. Well, if you were not absolutely sure, would it not prompt you to take a test and be absolutely sure that you were dealing with a very contagious disease?—A. I was satisfied we were dealing with simple vesicular stomatitis or we certainly would have gone further, and quicker, with the tests.

Q. You were satisfied, yes, but you did not know until you took a test, you could not be sure, and I cannot understand, knowing as you did the circumstances and knowing things as you did, that you did not exert yourself to the point of taking a test and making sure there was not any slip-up on this. I cannot understand that it took two months to decide to take a test to find out what disease you were handling, or trying to handle.—A. You will recall that we took a test on the first place that had this so-called vesicular stomatitis infection. The records show that there were lesions produced in inoculated horses, and from then on, that was December 2, it was contacts and of course, if our foresight at that time had been as good as our hindsight is now, we would have got along.

Q. I admit that; but I still won't admit that it should have taken you 2 months to make sure that you were right; and if you will admit to me that you were negligent, I will quit asking you questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Sinnott.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Dr. Childs, how long did you say you have been in the Department of Agriculture?

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Dr. Childs, how long did you say you had been in the Department of Agriculture?—A. Since September 25, 1925.

Q. Have you at any time discussed the disease of foot and mouth with your minister or your deputy minister?—A. Yes, if not before, we have done so very recently, in February.

Q. Have you at any time previous to that?—A. I could not recall discussing this, but it was quite likely we did because back through the last few years—yes, we have discussed foot and mouth disease and for this reason; we found it necessary and advisable and we considered it necessary to establish certain restrictions and prohibitions on imports of livestock and other materials from other lands on account of foot and mouth disease being present in those lands or else we were not sure that it was not. Yes, we have discussed foot and mouth disease.

Q. In other words, you have taken previous precautions?—A. Yes sir!

Q. Do you know the provincial veterinarian in each province in Canada?—A. Yes, I know them all.

Q. Do you know a Dr. Johnson in Saskatchewan?—A. Yes, I know Dr. Johnson.

Q. When did you come to know Dr. Johnson?—A. I could not say for sure when I first met Dr. Johnson. I believe it was a few years ago, but I cannot say for sure when I met him. Most certainly it was when I was out in Saskatchewan.

Q. Do you know how long Dr. Johnson has been a practising veterinarian?—A. I could not say for sure but at the present time I understand he is the provincial veterinarian in Saskatchewan.

Q. Did you have any direct phone calls from Dr. Johnson in connection with this outbreak in Saskatchewan?—A. No.

Q. You did not at any time?—A. No.

Q. When you went to Saskatchewan in February, did you discuss vesicular stomatitis with Dr. Johnson?—A. In February?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes, we discussed stomatitis and that was on the 18th. We had a discussion and we discussed it with Dr. Johnson and with Mr. Horner, the deputy minister of Agriculture, and with Mr. Brocklebank.

Q. Do you recall what took place at that time?—A. Well, yes; I had the unpleasant job of breaking the news to those people at that time that I thought, in fact I was convinced, that we had something worse than stomatitis present. And they were incredulous.

Q. Were Dr. Johnson's opinions the same as yours, that it was something worse than stomatitis?—A. I do not recall whether or not he offered an opinion on that.

Q. And as veterinary in Saskatchewan, Dr. Johnson thought that he had things pretty well in hand until you came out there?—A. I could not say that, I do not know just what he thought on that; but I am convinced that he was not seriously concerned about anything around there, nor was anybody else.

Q. How often have you ever been called upon before to determine stomatitis by the various provinces in Canada?—A. I have never been called to any of the provinces before during my time here.

Q. You say you have never been called.—A. Not from Ottawa, no.

Q. You got a wire from D. N. Christie, dated December 28, which said: "137 steers and 70 heifers of which 30 head are exhibiting symptoms of infectious vesicular stomatitis in Burns and Co. feed lots establishment 23E. Premises quarantined and report by Dr. N. V. James being mailed to you. Healthy animals allowed to be slaughtered." And then you wired back on the 29th: "Retel make certain no livestock leaves Burns feed lots except for immediate slaughter at Burns Packing Plant. If possible ascertain source infection." Now I gather from your wire back to him that you were worried as to what was taking place at that time. Is that right?—A. Yes, I was certainly concerned.

Q. And then we did not hear anything more until the 15th of February, when you sent this message: "Understand Dr. Hall in collaboration with Dr. Mitchell has issued instructions for collection and forwarding to laboratory Hull material from animals suffering from infectious vesicular condition. Those instructions definitely countermanded. Definite diagnosis must be made on premises where disease exists. Understand another horse has been inoculated. Hold quarantines tight and await results horse inoculations. Self on statutory leave when instructions collect material for laboratory examination issued by Dr. Hall. Wire acknowledgement immediately."—A. I did not issue the instructions to collect material for the laboratory; I did not give those instructions. They were given as indicated, while I was away on statutory leave.

Q. And even though this case was serious, you were away on statutory leave?—A. Yes, surely.

Q. In your position, being in charge of a very very serious matter like this, how in the world could you go on leave at that time?—A. We did not consider this condition serious up to this time, the time I went on statutory leave.

Q. Not even after you wired and said "make certain..."—A. I did, that is for sure.

Q. That was on the 29th of December.—A. I thought you were talking about the 15th of February just now.

Q. This is your wire of the 29th of December "make certain no livestock leaves Burns feed lots."—A. Yes, that would be correct.

Q. Who determined how long you would be on leave at that time?—A. I was not on leave at the time you are speaking of there, the 28th of December.

Q. No, but you say you were on leave here, on the 15th of February.—A. Yes.

Mr. STEWART: You are mentioning December.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Who determined how long you would be on leave, in view of the fact that this serious disease had broken out?—A. We did not know of any serious disease at that time.

Q. Do you not think in a man of your capacity, knowing as you do of this big responsibility, that of taking care of the department which you have, that it was a dereliction of duty for you to go on leave at that time?—A. Perhaps I should have forgone my statutory leave. As a matter of fact I have lost it. I hoped to get in 2 weeks and they would be the first 2 weeks in a period of 2 years that I have had statutory leave; and as I indicated before a number of times, we did not think that we had a serious condition on there, or I certainly would not have "went" on leave.

Q. When did you inform your minister or your deputy minister of this outbreak?—A. The telegram was filed about 11:30 on February 17; and I believe it got away from Regina in the early morning of the 18th. But we did not say "foot and mouth disease".

Q. Well, we will come to that later. What about the infected bulls that we heard about this afternoon?—A. Of course, if I may make a remark or two here, I discussed this with the deputy minister and the director, and it would be on the morning of the 16th, yes. I believe it was the morning of the 16th, before I left for Regina, in view of the communications and Dr. Carlson; we came to the conclusion that it was more serious than we had thought. That is why I dropped my statutory leave right there and moved west to the scene.

Q. Who is this Dr. Hall and this Dr. Mitchell?—A. Dr. Hall is my assistant.

Q. And Dr. Mitchell?—A. Dr. Mitchell is director of the Animal Disease Research Institute over in Hull, Quebec.

Q. When you were on leave for those 3 days, did these men not take over, and did they not think it was serious enough to collect the material which you mentioned?—A. Dr. Hall looks after these things when I am away, yes.

Q. During the time you were away the 2 men took on that job. I would have thought it would have been good policy for them to get this virus down here and sample it.—A. Dr. Hall takes over my work when I am away, not Dr. Mitchell. There are 2 separate services altogether.

Q. Did Dr. Hall give those directions?—A. I believe so.

Q. That is fine. Now, what about this Willie, this farm hand who was at one time thought to carry this disease as a carrier; how long would this virus live on human beings' clothes?—A. Oh, possibly 30 days or something like that; it would depend of course what was carrying the virus; if the virus was incorporated in dust or dirt in a dried condition, it would last longer perhaps than if it was just exposed on cloth or shoes; ordinarily it will last I believe around 30 days on boots carrying mud or manure or such like.

Q. If you suspected him, don't you think it would have been a good idea to send him back to the very same farm that he worked on in Germany and go over this whole performance and put it into a clean herd to see if that was the source of infection?—A. Of course I would not have the authority to do that.

Q. You would not have the authority to do that?—A. No.

Q. At any rate you were certain in your mind that this immigrant was not the carrier of that disease?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. I say that you were certain in your mind, at any rate, that this immigrant was not the carrier of that disease?—A. No, I am not certain either way; but that was a most likely source. We could not find any other sources of how the infection might have been introduced.

Q. What about these birds which hang around cows all the time, which are known as cow birds? Would you call them a serious source or carrier?

The CHAIRMAN: Order, the doctor did not hear the question.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Possibly these fellows who are farmers do not understand it but these birds that follow the cows all summer, known as cow birds, do you think they would be a serious source of carriers?—A. They could be, sir.

Q. Catching flies around cattle?—A. If they were lighting on infected animals they could be a source of spreading—mechanically, that is.

Q. Just one or two more questions and I am finished.

The CHAIRMAN: You have got about two minutes.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. You say that if you had to do this over again you would act a little sooner? Do you not think, Dr. Childs, that the Department of Agriculture had you for that purpose already?—A. Yes.

Q. Now that the horse is gone it is time to lock the door.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The cow is gone.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Don't you think you have just been a little bit derelict in your duty in not acting sooner?—A. Of course we would have acted sooner if we had suspected we had something serious.

Q. Of course, being head of the department it was up to you to determine that long before. In fairness to the country—and I am looking out for the people of this country and I want to find out what is what here.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Blame the Liberals.

Mr. SINNOTT: We are not going to blame the Liberals, we are not going to blame anybody but I can ask Dr. Childs another question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SINNOTT: If it had been a Liberal, Conservative or C.C.F. government you would have done the same thing? Right? You have no interest in politics?

The WITNESS: None whatsoever.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SINNOTT: Don't you think you should have acted a little sooner?

The WITNESS: Yes, looking back we should have acted a little sooner no doubt, but that is hindsight, of course.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Browne?

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Dr. Childs, please sit down.—A. Thank you.

Q. Do you remember making an annual report each year to the minister?—A. That is right, sir.

Q. Do you remember the report you made in 1950—and I am going to quote some of it to you. Here is the quotation: "As the danger of foot and mouth disease being introduced into Canada from countries where this disease is permitted to exist is always present, and has been enhanced during recent years by the ease and rapidity with which transportation may be effected by air, the presence of this disease in countries with which Canada has trade relations is a matter of deep concern." Do you remember saying that?—A. I wrote that, that is correct.

Q. "...it is imperative that the greatest vigilance be exercised at all times to prevent this disease from being introduced into Canada by regular trade channels." Do you remember that?—A. Surely.

Q. "Uncooked, chilled, or frozen meats, or meat food products from countries where the disease exists are particularly dangerous and no products of this nature are accepted for entry to Canada." Right?—A. That is right.

Q. Are they being accepted from provinces where that disease exists—into other provinces?—A. They are not being accepted.

Q. All right. Do you remember making your report of 1951?—A. Yes.

Q. Let me read this to you: "This disease has never gained a foothold in Canada, consequently Canadian livestock, that is cattle, other ruminants, and swine, can be considered as being decidedly vulnerable. Therefore, the introduction of this disease into Canada would likely be attended by greater than average mortality, and greater than average impairment to productive capacity of infected animals, if such animals were permitted to survive." Did you make that statement?—A. Yes, it was written—composed—by myself.

Q. Now, sir, you then agree that foot and mouth disease is a very serious disease?—A. Oh, certainly.

Q. Well, then it is not of the utmost importance that not a moment should be lost in diagnosing that disease—not a moment should be lost in diagnosing it?—A. No, we should not wait once we think we have it.

Q. You were informed, were you not, on December 3rd, 1951, that a vesicular disease in which cattle were shown to be lame and had symptoms which are the same as exist now existed in the Regina area? Right? There is a report here from Dr. Carlson and I will read it to you: "It was decided to contact Dr. Childs, veterinary director general, for further direction and decision." Where you not notified then?—A. That is the report.

Q. Is that right? You were notified then?—A. Surely.

Q. ...following this phone call Dr. James was detailed to quarantine the premises and keep a close watch on neighbouring premises.—Now, sir, I take it

you were given the symptoms these cattle in that area showed at the time, were you not? When they asked you for advice did they give that to you?—A. As written on that report.

Q. Do you want me to read them or will you accept them as they are here?—A. Read it.

Q. "...vesicular condition affecting the hoofs of several cows followed by drooling at the mouth...the infection first noticed...spread rapidly through the herd. ...quite severe erosions of the tongue and mouth...drooling saliva quite freely. All temperatures taken were normal. Six cows exhibited erosions of the teats which were quite sensitive...several of the cows showed reddening of the muzzle and nostrils...tentatively diagnosed as infectious stomatitis." That is enough to identify the information that was given to you?—A. Yes, that is enough to read.

Q. Now I think you have told other members there is some difficulty in distinguishing between vesicular stomatitis and foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. Some difficulty. Well, then you have in Hull an Animal Disease Research Institute where they can make a test which could determine that exactly. Is that not so?—A. Yes.

Q. Then why were not the facilities of that research institute availed of on December 3rd?—A. I think we have been over that before, sir, but you will recall also—

Q. I do not want you to recall anything else. I want to know why those facilities were not availed of on December 3rd?—A. All right, I will tell you as well as I can. We had two men there that checked over those animals—Drs. Carlson and James. Carlson had seen foot and mouth disease in Mexico, he had also had a special course down here in those diseases; and Dr. James had seen the epidemic of vesicular stomatitis that appeared in Saskatchewan in 1938 and 1939.

Q. Let me interrupt you a moment, Dr. Childs?

Some MEMBERS: Let him finish.

The WITNESS: They were both familiar with the diseases.

Mr. BROWNE: I want to point out the report said "tentatively diagnosed..."

The WITNESS: They were both familiar with those diseases.

Mr. HETLAND: Both experts.

The WITNESS: They were both familiar with those diseases. Of course, having men like that tell me that it was vesicular stomatitis—

By Mr. Browne:

Q. "...tentatively diagnosed..." they were not certain?—A. Yes.

Q. That is why I say: Why were not the facilities of the research institute availed of to determine what the disease was?—A. It was tentative until they made the field tests on the horses. That, of course, further supported their diagnosis that it was vesicular stomatitis.

Q. Why were those facilities not availed of?—A. There was no temperature. Those animals had no temperature and we did not think there was anything more serious than vesicular stomatitis. If we had we certainly would have gone all out on tests, both field and laboratory—both in the west and down here too.

Q. Now, that was December 3rd. Did you not think it was desirable to have that distinction made between stomatitis and foot and mouth disease as quickly as possible?—A. We thought we had made the distinction.

There was no examination made at the research institute until the 16th of February—two and a half months after December 3. Now, was it not desir-

able to have it made quickly? You would not call it quickly on February 15—two and a half months after December 3. You would not call that quickly?—A. The field tests are supposed to be good.

Q. Now, in view of the extreme danger of the spread of infection was it not an error in judgment not to have sent in specimens of the tissues and fluids of those animals that were suspected—even if it was only vesicular stomatitis?—A. Yes, looking back at it now we might have gone further afield with those things—no doubt about it. However, we were lulled into a state of mind that this was a simple vesicular stomatitis.

Q. Do you know from what animals the specimens which were eventually sent in by Dr. Carlson on the 15th of February were taken?—A. I believe they were taken from Burns.

Q. Now you know, Dr. Childs, that all cattle that were infected or that associated with cattle that were infected from November at the Waas farm right down to this date have been shot. All the cattle, infected or that associated with infected cattle have been shot? Is that right?—A. I believe that to be true.

Q. Therefore the department now regards it as a very serious thing. Why did you not regard it as serious in December?—A. Well, we did not have—

Q. For these cattle here the quarantine was lifted. Let me read to you. "L. T. Waas . . . put in quarantine December 3, quarantine lifted December 8."

Do you think that was a sufficient time for quarantine?—A. The animals were reported as fully recovered.

Q. Do you think that was sufficient time? On March 13 they were all slaughtered—those same animals?—A. Sure they were; yes.

Q. Are you not convinced now this was foot and mouth disease from the very beginning?—A. Not necessarily.

Q. Well, where do you say the foot and mouth disease began?—A. We think it began at Waas's, yes.

Q. That was in November?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, that is the question I asked. Are you not convinced that was foot and mouth disease from the beginning?—A. I am not altogether convinced because there was a possibility that both vesicular stomatitis and foot and mouth virus were present.

Q. You think in the same animals?—A. Could be.

Q. They could have both diseases?—A. I do not see why not.

Q. Well supposing they have, is it not doubly serious? Both contagious diseases existing in the same animals and you let it go on. Don't you think it was doubly serious?

Now, sir, let me draw your attention to the fact that this disease you say might be both stomatitis and foot and mouth disease yet there is no record of any letter of instructions from you from January 4 until February 15? Is that right?—A. That is correct.

Q. And you went on your leave on February 11?—A. Yes.

Q. As soon as you went on your leave did not Dr. Hall give instructions that specimens be taken immediately?—A. I believe the day after I went on leave—on the 12th Mr. Carlson's message came in. We have been over this several times before, I would remind you. Mr. Carlson's message came in saying that disease was taking on greater malignancy, his telephone message.

Q. Dr. Carlson?—A. I believe.

Q. Then Dr. Hall gave him instructions to take steps to obtain specimens of tissue and fluid?—A. Yes.

Q. Then you came into the office on the 15th, and did you then tell Dr. Hall that you disapproved of that procedure?—A. I believe so.

Q. You said yesterday that you didn't think you had?—A. I don't recall saying that I didn't think I had.

Q. Did you go to your home that night and from your home 'phone a message to the Canadian National Telegraph Company countermanding that order?—A. Yes, I did.

Q. Wasn't that a mistake on your part?—A. No.

Q. So the Burns' specimens which came as the result of Carlson's conversations over the telephone with Dr. Hall were the ones which definitely determined that this disease was foot and mouth disease?—A. They were.

Q. And if your message to Dr. Carlson had got through in time these specimens would not have come?—A. They would not have come, no. I would have been out there making field tests.

Q. But you were out there in January?—A. Yes.

Q. Why did you not make the field test then?—A. There was nothing to make field tests on at that time.

Q. This disease was known to exist from the 18th of December, was it not?—A. Sure enough.

Q. It was known that these herds had the disease in December when you were out there?—A. Yes.

Q. And these herds had to be destroyed in the same way as the others were?—A. Yes.

Q. Why?—A. They had to be destroyed because of the fact that they might be carriers, possibly were carrying the virus in some form, or some of them. We could not take a chance with them.

Q. Now, Dr. Childs, coming back to the situation at Ottawa. In view of the results of Dr. Mitchell's examination of that tissue and these blood specimens, were you not in error in countermanding the instructions to Dr. Hall to send it in?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. I put it to you that you were in error because they supplied proof that foot and mouth disease was in Canada and nobody knew it up to that time.—A. But you will recall that we did not get verification, official verification of this until the 24th.

Q. I have only one more question. Don't you think that every effort should have been made to identify the disease; at any rate that every effort should have been made to identify the disease, and then when it was identified there should have been publicity given to it immediately?—A. Would you repeat that, sir?

Q. Don't you think that every effort should have been made to identify the disease and that full publicity should have been given to the fact that the disease was there?—A. Yes. Looking back, of course, we would do things differently if we had to do them over again. As to the publicity, once the newspapers got the word there was plenty of publicity; and I might say folks, gentlemen—

Q. I have a couple of more questions.

The WITNESS: If I might—

Mr. DECORE: You might let him finish his answer.

The CHAIRMAN: He was giving his answer.

Mr. BROWNE: When was the first publicity given the first press release?

The WITNESS: I might say here that we have been terribly hampered in our work since by the excessive publicity that was given to this, very much so. On the 18th of January when I started to make these moves that tied up this thing, these essential moves—

Mr. CHARLTON: February.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, February.

The WITNESS: February, I beg your pardon and I thank you for correcting me, Dr. Charlton. Within an hour or so we had the newspaper reporters barging

in. This was a time of stress when everybody needed all their wits and the time at their disposal. The boys were just trying to get done what needed to be done. We had that publicity right away. They were barging in, coming in—and you cannot blame them, it was something new—but nevertheless the publicity that has been given to us in various quarters has hampered us a lot in our work. For instance, we have been flooded with letters and communications from all directions offering cures, preventatives, giving advice, criticism—and commendation in some cases—some very recently, and so on. We got plenty of publicity once it became known that it was foot and mouth disease. It has been very highly advertised.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Charlton, and then Mr. Decore.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Dr. Childs, you have had considerable experience with both vesicular stomatitis and foot and mouth disease? You have seen foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. And I understand that you have seen a considerable amount of vesicular stomatitis during the time that you have been with the department?—A. Yes, that is so.

Q. You have seen a lot of it?—A. Yes.

Q. And you can tell it pretty well, you can tell the difference between the two diseases?—A. Yes, I believe I can, on close examination; but, doctor, I would not depend on that altogether.

Q. No, I realize that, doctor; and that would be your reason for disagreeing with the authors Hagen and Bruner to whom Mr. Argue referred when he asked you whether you agreed with what they said in their book and you said that you did not. You stated that you disagreed with these text books to which Mr. Argue referred last night?—A. I do not recall saying that I didn't agree with them.

Q. And they said that it was impossible to diagnose this disease, as I understand it, without animal inoculations. That is what I understood, but mind you, I might be wrong. I understood that Mr. Argue asked you if you agreed with that statement and you said that you did not.

Mr. LAING: He said not entirely, not 100 percent.

Mr. ARGUE: He said he did not agree.

Mr. CHARLTON: If the honourable member on my right would let the witness answer the question.

Mr. DECORE: I do not think that is what the witness answered yesterday; he said that he did not agree entirely. You said that he said yesterday that he disagreed.

Mr. ARGUE: He is here and he can speak for himself.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. I think Dr. Childs can answer for himself.

The WITNESS: I have lost track of it I am afraid. If you don't mind repeating, Dr. Charlton.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Mr. Argue asked you last night if you did not agree with Hagen and Bruner, the authors of this book in which it says (page 670) "when the disease occurs in cattle only special inoculations are required definitely to differentiate this disease from foot and mouth disease." Now, do you agree with that statement?—A. Yes, I do agree, almost fully. Yes.

Q. You agree almost fully?—A. Yes, that is to verify the clinical diagnosis.

Q. To verify your clinical diagnosis.—A. To support it, sure.

Q. And you said a moment ago that you could tell by clinical examination the difference between the two diseases?—A. Yes, but I qualified that by saying that I would not depend on that; I would go further and take specimens in the case of foot and mouth disease.

Q. You would go further than that?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you at any time, Dr. Childs, ever speak to your officials in the field, did you ever tell them that you could tell it, or intimate to them that animal inoculations were not absolutely necessary?—A. No. I never told anybody that, I never mentioned that to anybody, that animal inoculations were not necessary; in fact, I consider animal inoculations a very important part of the diagnosis.

Q. Did you allow your officials in the field to go ahead and make animal inoculations whenever they consider it necessary?—A. No, I would want to keep control of that.

Q. You would want to keep control of that?—A. Oh yes.

Q. Now, I see here, on February 23rd a wire to you, from Dr. Wells:

"Suggest you phone Storey re stomatitis southern Alberta Stop In view lack of developments test animals here will you approve supplementary animal inoculations here Stop Unless negative decision received near future I feel general farm to farm inspection in quarantine area urgent Stop Additional staff needed if farm to farm inspection instituted Stop Please advise". Now, Dr. Wells thought farm to farm inspection was urgent but he did not go ahead with the animal inoculations until he had consulted you?—A. That is correct.

Q. Did you permit it?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, on the next page I see you sent a wire—yes, you did.—A. I might say, Dr. Charlton, at that time Dr. Shahan, foot and mouth disease research specialist of the Bureau of Animal Industry at Washington, had arrived at Regina and he had recommended that these field tests be carried on again—I have gone over that already, you know—three of the animals had not reacted or had not come down with the disease during that time, three of the animals which were inoculated on the 18th.

Q. These animals were injected on the 17th or 18th?—A. It was on the 18th.

Q. Now, here is a letter which I would like to bring to your attention. I will read it:—"As you were advised over the telephone today, we have received a report of sickness in cattle at Beechy, Sask. The roads to Beechy are entirely blocked. It is possible, as you have suggested, to send a man by train from Saskatoon. However, a trip of this nature by train would take four days and, unfortunately, we have not sufficient staff to permit a man four days for one call. The only other alternative is to have a veterinary officer travel in by light plane. Such transportation is available for rent and can readily be arranged for by Mr. L. B. Thomson, Director, P.F.R.A., who is in the habit of using this mode of travelling.

It is realized that you suggested the call could wait for a few days in the hope that the roads would be open."—It is dated February 26th. Would you suggest that an investigation of that type could wait for a few days?—A. Yes, in the case, knowing the terrain as I do and the distance, this report came in from the centre of infection. I thought it could wait but you will find if you read on that if the roads did not open we would send him in by plane.

Mr. CHARLTON: But you suggested we could wait.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you going to be much longer, Mr. Charlton?

Mr. CHARLTON: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart just wants to ask one question before we adjourn, or are you not particular about it, Mr. Stewart?

Mr. STEWART: Well, one of the other members asked me a question to ask.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. To be fair to Dr. Childs, I want to read a part of the next letter he wrote to Dr. Christie in reply to that wire, and here is the part that is so effective: "A delay of only a few hours in dealing with an essential feature of the work could well cost the Canadian public many millions of dollars." This is where he says to go ahead and use the plane—"could well cost the Canadian people many millions of dollars."

Now, on the one hand you say it would not make much difference to wait a day, and on the other hand you say a delay of a few hours would be very costly.

Now, another thing, in the case of the second horse inoculation, one horse was inoculated on December 12 at the Woods farm, the third horse was inoculated on February 12 on the Haun farm. None of these horses gave a positive reaction, did they?—A. They did not. But if I might cut in here, if you will permit, three of the animals that we inoculated with fresh virus on the 18th never did react; susceptible animals.

Q. Yes, I know, but the very fact that these two animals did not react—would that lead you to believe that it was foot and mouth disease? Would not that lead you to believe that there was foot and mouth disease, doctor, when they did not react?—A. Not necessarily, because these were contact animals from Waas, and our men there had diagnosed that as vesicular stomatitis. They were experienced men and, furthermore, the horse inoculation there was positive, or so reported.

Q. They diagnosed the first one because there were positive reactions in the horses. They diagnosed that vesicular stomatitis because there were positive reactions in the horses that were inoculated, and yet on the second and third horses that were inoculated there was no reaction, and still you kept to the same diagnosis. Here on January 2, the report signed by Dr. James on the farm of R. Clifton, says:—"I visited the above premises and inspected two horses and two cattle and found that up to the present time the horses have not become infected although they are stabled in stalls adjoining stalls occupied by the two cows which are exhibiting very severe symptoms of stomatitis."

Now, when you studied that report, Dr. Childs, that is on January 2, would that not appear strange to you that two horses in adjacent stalls to two cattle that were infected showing very severe symptoms of stomatitis, which were showing in these cattle—would that not lead you to believe it was foot and mouth disease?—A. It is not as good evidence as in some of these herds that were affected. Some of the cattle in infected herds never showed any symptoms whatever.

Q. Oh yes, I know; but these cattle were stabled in stalls; and the horses were stabled in stalls adjoining cows which were exhibiting very severe symptoms of stomatitis.

The CHAIRMAN: Before you leave, gentlemen, I think we should decide on the next meeting. Shall it be on Monday morning?

The WITNESS: I am willing to go on, sir, if you wish.

The CHAIRMAN: You mean to go on to-night?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: That is entirely up to the meeting.

Mr. WYLIE: Mr. Chairman, I move that we adjourn to meet on Monday morning at 11:00.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Wylie—

Mr. WRIGHT: Before we adjourn there is a question I want to ask with regard to the calling of witnesses. I think the witnesses should be called before Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to make a statement about witnesses for Monday. But I shall put Mr. Wylie's motion first. It has been moved that we adjourn to meet again on Monday morning at 11:00. All those in favour of the motion? Those contrary?

Agreed.

Now, I have been advised that Dr. Hall is not yet back, but I believe that he could be here on Monday afternoon; however, Dr. Mitchell could be on hand on Monday morning. Is it agreed that we have Dr. Mitchell, the pathologist, here on Monday morning?

Agreed.

Dr. Carlson and Dr. James will be here ready for Tuesday. I have got that advice. And Dr. Wells will be here for Thursday. Dr. Carlson has to go back to Regina, I understand, on Tuesday night.

Mr. WRIGHT: I wanted to raise the matter of calling two witnesses who are not on your list, Dr. Hewitt, B.S. of Regina, a private practitioner there who came into contact with some of these herds, and constable W. Sherman, who made the report which was asked for in the House, when Mr. Garson stated that he could not table the report, but that the constable might be called before the committee to give evidence. I would like to request that these 2 gentlemen be called.

The CHAIRMAN: We will look into that.

Mr. ARGUE: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to the members of the committee, if we are not to have too much repetition, to have the minutes of proceeding printed as quickly as possible, and I wonder if you could look into that point and see if we could not have all the evidence up to date before us before Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall do so.

The committee adjourned.

HD
1781
138
1952
N 4

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE


No. 4

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1952

WITNESSES:

Dr. E. E. Carlson and Dr. N. V. James, Health of Animals Division,
Department of Agriculture.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1952



ORDERS OF REFERENCE

FRIDAY, May 2, 1952.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Gardiner be substituted for that of Mr. Welbourn on the said Committee.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Sinnott be substituted for that of Mr. Demers on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, May 5, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Decore, Diefenbaker, Fair, Gardiner, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kickham, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, Major, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Oxford*), Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Dr. E. E. Carlson and Dr. N. V. James, Health of Animals Division, Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Carlson was called, heard and questioned.

During the questioning of the witness by Mr. Wright, a point of order having been raised, the Chairman ruled that a letter from which Mr. Wright was quoting, and on which he was basing certain questions, must be tabled.

Mr. Wright refused to comply with the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. Murray (*Cariboo*) then moved that the letter be read by the Clerk.

And the question having been put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Whereupon Mr. Wright again refused to table the letter in question and stated his intention of appealing the Chairman's ruling to the House.

Mr. Charlton tabled a circular letter dated April 18, 1951, from the Veterinary Director General addressed to all Canadian veterinarians on the subject of Foot and Mouth Disease, which is printed as *Appendix A* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

On motion of Mr. Stewart, at 1 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 4 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Decore, Diefenbaker, Dumas, Fair, Gardiner, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, Major, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, Whitman, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Dr. E. E. Carlson and Dr. N. V. James, Health of Animals Division, Department of Agriculture.

Examination of Dr. Carlson was continued.

Dr. Carlson was retired.

Dr. N. V. James was called, questioned and retired.

At 6.45 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until Tuesday, May 6, at 11 o'clock a.m.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

MAY 5, 1952.

11.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order please, gentlemen. When we adjourned on Friday evening last it was suggested and I think settled that we would have Dr. Mitchell with us this morning, but I will read to you a change which I think perhaps should take place this morning:—"When Dr. Carlson and Dr. James of Regina, were instructed to come to Ottawa to appear before the committee on Tuesday, May 6, airline accommodation was not available for the required time. However, they were able to secure accommodation on an Air Force plane which arrived in Ottawa late Saturday. Consequently these veterinarians are now in Ottawa and can give evidence today if the committee so desires. In order that they may return to their duties at Regina, it is suggested that the committee hear them immediately and defer calling Doctors Mitchell and Hall until later today or tomorrow. This arrangement would enable these men to return to their duties at Regina a day earlier than would be the case if they do not appear before the committee until tomorrow.

Dr. Wells has been notified to be available to appear before the committee not later than Thursday."

Will someone move that that be concurred in.

Mr. QUELCH: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if before we hear witnesses we could have a report from the Minister of Agriculture about any other outbreak of foot and mouth disease?

The CHAIRMAN: We should deal with the motion first. All in favour of the motion?

Carried.

Mr. WRIGHT: After this witness is Dr. Christie going to be called?

The CHAIRMAN: I have no idea, I cannot say who may be called.

Mr. STEWART: That is up to the steering committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, it would be up to the steering committee, to suggest whom we would call.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, if there is nothing else of a preliminary nature I would ask for the production of an itemized statement showing the disposal of meat, beef and hides and so on, from the Burns' company plant in particular, during the period of the quarantine; then, secondly, a record of all shipments which have been made of live bulls from Regina during the period December, January and February—prior to their destruction. I ask that because I think it would be most important to know whether or not any of this semen has been shipped out; and, particularly, I understand that some of them that suffered from the disease in December were subsequently sold and used to breed.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the honourable member for Acadia, I would just like to read you a telegram. I get telegrams every morning from either Dr. Wells or Dr. Christie and others who happen to be here at Regina, with regard to new cases; and this one reads as follows:

One new infected premise uncovered in Weyburn area this evening.

That was on May 4.

22 cattle 89 swine involved. Owner Sam McGonicgal purchased calf from infected premises of George Johnston. No other contacts expected.

And now, respecting the other question which was just raised by Mr. Diefenbaker, I think in so far as it is possible to do so that the information with regard to such matters should be obtained from the officials who are on the stand from time to time. These men are here this morning from Regina, right from where the matter is being handled, and they have had something to do with the questions which have been raised, and I think, so far as possible, the information should be obtained from them.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: The reason for asking for that information was because if we knew that we would have what was the cause of any spread to that farm and it might save time.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The only thing about that is this: I think I would have some doubts—and I hope the honourable member will take the same position as I take myself—I would have some doubts about the advisability of putting either on the table of the House or on the table of this committee the breedings in connection with these bulls. The individual knows who had the bulls bred, and I think there is so much involved in that that I do not need to go into an explanation about it. There is so much involved in that, there could be very strong exceptions taken. That is why I ask that the matter be not pressed at this time. There may be a time that it should be pressed. It can be allowed to stand until we have the information the officials have on it. I suggest that it would be better to wait until we are in a better position to see just what happened there.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, as far as that goes I do not think the farmers are concerned. I would not want to cause them personal embarrassment and, of course, I am not going to press for the information for the very reasons advanced by the minister; but it certainly does strike one that this might be the cause of this kind of thing happening during that period between the 1st of December and the end of January. In the circumstances one would certainly want to ascertain what had happened, and also to what extent infection may have been spread. I would like to have the information from the time these bulls were first found to be diseased, which I understand was quite early in the period; and, why from that day on any official of the Department of Agriculture allowed shipments of semen from these particular animals. One would think, to an ordinary layman, that would amount to the most serious dereliction of duty, and the less said about it the better at the moment.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he has any objection to tabling all the regulations present in force in the quarantine area with respect to the prevention of the spread of this disease, and also what the regulations are in the buffer area. I think that is pretty important that we know what these regulations are so that we can determine whether we think they are sufficient or not.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I thought, and if I am not right then the officials who happen to be sitting here now can tell you when they are on their feet—I thought these men would know this better than anybody else and that would be better than putting on the record all the details of what the position is, because these things do change more or less from day to day; new problems develop, and they deal with them with the authority they have now, and have been dealing with them; I think they could tell the story much better than any documents put on the record. If, after they have told the story, something else is wanted we will do something about that later on.

MR. WRIGHT: Usually the regulations are issued by the department.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, they know it better than anybody else; some may be issued by them rather than by the department.

MR. WRIGHT: But, Mr. Minister, we must elicit that information from them in our questioning on the regulations. If the regulations are tabled then we

would have all the details and know what all the regulations are. I think they should certainly be before this committee regardless of what evidence they may give, and then we will be in a better position to judge whether proper action is being taken, and we cannot do that without knowing what the regulations are. Not to have the regulations before us when we are questioning the witness does not seem to me to be common sense.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I do not have any objection to that, I was just considering the best method of producing them. What I am suggesting is that these men will know what the regulations are. They will have copies of them. It is all right for them to be read and presented to you. If you do not want to get it that way and prefer the other way, the way I was suggesting, I have no objection to either way.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we should have those regulations before us when we are questioning these witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: Louder, please, Mr. Wright.

Mr. WRIGHT: I think we should have the regulations before us when we are questioning the witnesses. It is very difficult to know what actions are being taken or what action should be taken unless we have the regulations here to go by.

Mr. JUTRAS: With respect to your last question, Mr. Wright, I am assured by an official of the department that they have the regulations here and I understand that the proper official of the department is quite prepared to present them.

Mr. WRIGHT: I think we should have them before us when we are questioning the witnesses. That is my personal view of the matter.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Carlson tells me that he is in the position to give you a very clear review of all the regulations as to what they are doing, and if you are not satisfied with what is here we will get the complete regulations for you.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, is it the pleasure of the committee to call Dr. Carlson?

Dr. E. E. Carlson, Assistant District Veterinarian, Regina, Saskatchewan, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Mr. Gardiner and gentlemen; I am assistant district veterinarian under Dr. Christie at Regina and have been since the present outbreak started and I am prepared to endeavour to answer any questions that are within my scope and within my ability to do so.

Mr. WRIGHT: Dr. Carlson, could you give us a statement of just what happened out there from the start?

Mr. STEWART: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Carlson first give the committee, so we will have as we would in any matter, a complete record of how long you were with the department, your qualifications, and so forth. You may be a little sensitive about that, but let us know how long you have been with the department and so forth, so the committee may know what weight to attach to what you say.

The WITNESS: Gentlemen, I have been with the department for 22½ years largely in Saskatchewan, connected partly with field work and partly with meat inspection; I would say about half each. During the last five years I have been Dr. Christie's assistant in Regina, and as Dr. Christie's assistant I have been in charge of inspecting packing plants within the province; and I haven't had a great deal to do with field operations except that any assistant has on occasion to be a Jack-of-all-trades more or less.

Now, the story of our difficulties out there. I suppose it is better to begin at the beginning of the story. I was one of the first, along with Dr. James, to visit these premises where this vesicular condition first started. As the records would indicate I personally received a telephone call from Dr. Hunter to the superintendent at Regina reporting that he had a vesicular condition; and it is always understood of course, that vesicular conditions are to be reported for further investigation to determine the scope of the outbreak. As soon as possible I contacted Dr. James and with Dr. James visited the Waas premises. This vesicular condition resembled, to us, stomatitis. I think my report will indicate that I suspected infectious stomatitis.

Mr. ARGUE: What date would that be?

The WITNESS: That would be December 3rd—pardon me, December 2nd.

The CHAIRMAN: December 2nd?

The WITNESS: Yes. We made a thorough investigation of these cattle and at the time I did not think there was any evidence; owing to the mildness of the condition, we did not suspect foot and mouth disease. As you know, specimens were not taken, because we have a ruling in the department which I think has been explained to you, that specimens are not to be taken of a suspected foot and mouth or vesicular condition. We did not suspect foot and mouth disease because of the very mild nature of the disease. Now, on the following morning, which was, of course, the morning that it was reported to Dr. Christie and Dr. James were detailed to take over the investigation, Dr. James of course handled it from there on; now, I did not enter the picture again until later on in February when I visited with Dr. James on a premises north of Regina and saw a pig with foot separations, which didn't look a bit good. Then is when I suspected foot and mouth disease.

Mr. BRYCE: What date was that?

The WITNESS: That was February 12th. And I believe that resulted from the phone call to Dr. Hall the following day. Specimens were procured the following day and forwarded to Ottawa resulting, as you know, in the positive diagnosis. Now, the clinical picture up until that time would not indicate foot and mouth disease. You must bear in mind the geographical location, the fact that we have never had foot and mouth disease in Canada before; and it would have been preposterous for any veterinary to suspect foot and mouth disease—naturally, he would have been quite a hero. He would have gained the headlines of the papers had he stated that he suspected foot and mouth disease had it been found to be correct. That would be just like holding a ticket on a winner in the derby; certainly, he would be extremely lucky.

Now, the disease at the present time does not bear the clinical picture that it did at that time. There is no comparison whatever. I am speaking about the clinical basis of what is seen in the field. Now, the diagnosis of a vesicular disease is a very, very difficult thing. You just do not run around and say it is this and it is that; it takes a laboratory diagnosis to confirm these things when the clinical picture is not too clear. You speak of field diagnosis, that can also be tricky too; because Dr. James in his field diagnosis, field tests got blisters in horses. Now, these blisters in horses would indicate that it was not foot and mouth disease; so you can see there was no cause for alarm as far as we were concerned at that time.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to ask the witness—

Mr. STEWART: Let him go ahead and finish his story.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think we will let him try to finish giving us the whole of his story.

The WITNESS: Speaking of diagnosis as you know, we are not experienced in this country with foot and mouth disease. Experienced men would have

been the last to criticize us on this diagnosis. We have Americans in the Regina area at the present time and they have offered no criticism of what we have done, they think we have done a remarkable job out there.

Mr. ARGUE: Let's deal with what we have here.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You are asking for these records and you will have them.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Surely that is not evidence—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I object to a member of this committee to all intents and purposes offering remarks which are very objectionable with regard to a witness on the stand and what he is saying. We should hear his evidence first, and when we have heard it through make our decisions based on that. You are not in a police court now. All you are trying to do is make political material out of it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We are at least trying to get justice. The statement was made by the witness as to what somebody else has said without offering any proof in support of such statement. I would say to the committee this: we want the evidence. The witness in giving his evidence said that they considered calling in other people and that there was somebody there who told him it is all right; when as a matter of fact evidence may indicate that it was all wrong. Statements of that kind are not evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On a point of order: just be a little patient and don't break in every time you feel that way, pay attention to the witness on the stand.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, in making statements of that kind the witness is not giving evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He is entitled to the protection of this committee and I mean to see that he gets it—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I want the facts, Mr. Chairman; that is all. You want protection.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I think that is what he is giving you, he did refer to the opinions of certain American officials who happened to be out there.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is what I objected to.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: All my honourable friend wants to do is to paint a political picture as a result of these sittings; nothing else, nothing more. The reference before this committee has to do with foot and mouth disease, but that is something entirely different. Let us get on and deal with the disease and not deal with our political views. I have something to say to my honourable friend.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister doesn't want political views because he is afraid of being embarrassed by them.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: My experience has extended over a long period. My honourable friend will have considerable difficulty proving his views that I am afraid of political embarrassment, but this is not the place to do it. We will do it in due course but here, now, I do not think the witness, to use a stronger term, should be insulted by a member of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: On a question of privilege. There is no question of insult or anything of that sort. I may say that never a word has passed my lips about gross negligence in this case. I have been listening to the evidence

and I do not want to prejudge this—and that is why I have not said after listening to the witness that the evidence does reveal gross negligence or apathy on the part of the witnesses. I am not saying that at the moment but, certainly, the witness should not be telling that somebody else said they were satisfied with what happened.

Mr. JUTRAS: On a point of order. As the minister says this is not a court. The member refers constantly to evidence and only pure evidence being allowed before the committee. I am not a technical person but I want to know about this disease. I want to know about the opinions of those who are supposed to know—like the opinion of a prominent veterinarian from the United States.

I think it is important to the question and I do not think we should limit the witness exclusively to evidence. I think we should have opinion.

The WITNESS: It has always been evident to me that any criticism comes from people who least know the disease. The more you know the disease the least you will be likely to criticize. It is one of the most difficult diseases to deal with. It plays tricks on you and it appears with different clinical pictures.

You must bear in mind this is the first time we have had it. I can show you literature from the United States on one outbreak which took five months to diagnose. They are fellows who have had twelve outbreaks or thereabouts.

I can show you a pamphlet by the United States Department of Agriculture quoting the 1932 outbreak of foot and mouth disease in southern California in which 18,000 pigs were destroyed, 40,000 some odd cattle, and a few goats. That diagnosis was incorrect. It never was foot and mouth disease, and somebody would like to eat the pamphlet but I suppose it was published and distributed before the diagnosis was properly made. That is how tricky foot and mouth disease can be.

I submit that there are only a handful of men in the world who know all that there is about foot and mouth disease—if they do know it all and I doubt that—and they are still studying it. I submit there are very few men on this continent with sufficient knowledge of foot and mouth disease to get down to basically criticizing on any scientific basis.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. Can you explain to us Type "A"—there is reference to type A here. Is that a mild type?—A. Not necessarily. It is one of the milder types but the types vary in severeness.

Q. How many types are there?—A. "A", "O", "C"—there are new ones, varying new ones dug up constantly from time to time.

Q. You referred to the clinical qualities being changed since the start?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Louder.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. You referred to the clinical appearance being changed at the present time?—A. Oh, definitely.

Q. Is it more severe?—A. Oh, yes, absolutely, it is. The foot lesions are very pronounced.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Diefenbaker?

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Just a few questions in regard to what the doctor says about laboratory tests being the only way in which the matter can be determined.—A. That is the definite way—the only proper way.

Q. The only proper way?—A. Field tests are used but they can kick back on you—at least that is my professional opinion; but I may be wrong.

Q. It is your professional opinion based on fine experience in a fine public service that the only way in which determination can be made final is through laboratory tests?—A. That is the way I would like to have it made.

Q. And field tests and these other visual examinations do not finally determine whether or not it is foot and mouth disease or ordinary stomatitis, do they?—A. When you have an outbreak it possibly would.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. When you have an outbreak and you are just working on that outbreak it possibly would.

Q. When it is just an isolated case here and there it requires laboratory tests?—A. I would prefer that.

Q. Did you receive instructions from Dr. Childs not to have laboratory tests taken?—A. I did not personally, sir.

Q. Did anyone in the office in the month of December or January receive those instructions from your knowledge or information?

Mr. LAING: That would be hard for him to say?

The WITNESS: I understand Dr. Christie did, but it has always been my understanding, sir, in the twenty-three years I have been in the service, that we were never to send specimens. That dates back as far as I can remember. I cannot prove it in writing but it has been my understanding that vesicular diseases were not to be submitted for laboratory diagnosis because of the danger of transportation.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Now, on the danger of transportation, as someone has said it is always easy to look back and say we could have done differently; that we always have better hindsight than foresight; but had you not officials going back and forth from Regina to Ottawa? Did you not have them during the period December and January?—A. Yes, I suppose we did.

Q. Dr. Childs was out there in December?—A. I cannot recall it in December.

Q. He was there in January though?—A. Yes.

Q. You saw him in January did you not, when he was out there?—A. Yes.

Q. And I put it to you on that occasion you raised the question of this being possibly foot-and-mouth disease of a mild nature?—A. At that time we did not suspect foot-and-mouth disease.

Q. Did you not mention it in any way?—A. I do not believe I mentioned foot-and-mouth disease. We did not discuss the words foot-and-mouth disease—that was a taboo word.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. Foot-and-mouth disease was always more or less a word we did not discuss.

Q. The use of the word foot-and-mouth disease was more or less taboo in the department?—A. Because of it having international and trade complications.

Q. You would not want to come to a conclusion of foot-and-mouth disease on an international basis, and also on the basis of danger to the industry in the country and to the whole cattle industry? That would be the reason you did not even want to think of the possibility of it coming into our midst?—A. You would be very cautious about speaking about foot-and-mouth disease in a country where it was never known to exist.

Q. That being so, would it not have been so easy, as these cases arose in January, so easy with officials going back and forth to Ottawa, to have sent samples down for examination by Dr. Mitchell?—A. Yes, using hindsight; yes.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. Using hindsight it would have been.

Q. And even using ordinary common sense at the time would that not have been a precautionary measure that ought well to have been taken?—

A. We are sorry now that it was not taken but we do have a rule that samples cannot be sent.

Mr. MURRAY: Could it have been done safely?

The WITNESS: I guess it is not too safe. They do not permit it in the United States. A man down there would be fired if he sent samples.

Mr. ARGUE: You are sending them all the time now?

The WITNESS: Yes, because Dr. Mitchell is prepared now to get them.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. That is the strange thing about it. Since it has been established as foot-and-mouth disease you are shipping samples down all the time?—A. Yes, under great care.

Q. Before it was established as being foot-and-mouth disease you had to be so careful about any samples that were sent for fear of the disease being distributed by breaking of the containers in other parts of the country?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Now, as an outstanding veterinarian, can you tell the committee whether or not semen distributed from infected animals or those having had contact with infected animals is a dangerous thing to the spread of the disease?—A. It could possibly be so but I think that has all been checked.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. I think all that was checked—all possible contacts in respect of semen or a contact of any kind—they were thoroughly looked into and checked.

Q. Is it not a fact that early in December some bulls kept by the Department of Agriculture developed symptoms of what appeared to be stomatitis?—A. Nothing to my knowledge.

Q. Not to your knowledge?—A. No, sir.

Q. In the event that those animals had those symptoms would you consider it a safe thing to be distributing semen from animals that either had the disease or had been in contact with it?—A. I would say at that time, sir, you were not dealing with foot-and-mouth disease.

Q. No, no, but—A. It would depend on the disease you suspected at that time. Possibly with other diseases it would have been perfectly safe.

Q. One thing you have to be sure of is to make assurance doubly sure that this disease be not spread. That is one thing—every precaution should be taken that it be not spread if it is foot-and-mouth disease?—A. That is correct.

Q. And not having taken these laboratory tests without which you cannot determine it you would require greater precautions? Even though at that time you, by visual examination, concluded it was stomatitis? Would that not be right?—A. I did not quite get the question.

Q. Did you have any fear that this might be foot and mouth disease?—A. In February, sir.

Q. Not before?—A. No.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. Not fear—I was not entirely satisfied that we had made a proper diagnosis but I could not say I feared foot and mouth disease.

Q. How could you be sure you had made a proper diagnosis when the only way to determine whether it is a mild case of foot and mouth disease is by laboratory tests?—A. You could not be sure but the symptoms were very mild and, on account of the geographic location, you would not expect foot and mouth disease. Only by hindsight could you expect foot and mouth disease.

Q. I have only one more question. I ask you whether or not on February 4, 1952, some farmers communicated with you in Regina and asked you whether or not there was any possibility of this being foot and mouth disease?—

A. With me, sir?

Q. Yes, on the 4th of February?—A. Is the letter addressed to me or to Dr. Christie?

Q. No, by conversation—in conversation?—A. I do not recall anything like that, sir.

Q. You do not recall it?—A. No.

Q. Now, then, is there any danger of spreading foot and mouth disease as we now know it to be by the shipment of hides from Burns and Company during the period January and February?—A. It would be possible.

Q. And what about the tallow and offal and the like?—A. I would not say the tallow—because it is sterilized in its manufacture.

Q. But from the offal?—A. Yes—a possibility—but most offal is cooked.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. Most offal is cooked so I would say the danger there would be very, very slight.

Q. If it was uncooked but frozen and shipped to other parts of the country?—A. If fed to an animal—otherwise it would be very unlikely. These things do not go out as animal feed.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. You stated, Dr. Carlson, that laboratory diagnosis was necessary to determine a vesicular disease?—A. No, I did not. To differentiate and to make a proper diagnosis—not to determine it. We had already determined on our first visit that we had a vesicular disease. To determine the nature of it it would be necessary to make a diagnosis.

Q. Was that diagnosis made?—A. In February, sir.

Q. But you knew you had a vesicular disease on the 2nd of December?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. And you did not attempt to make any diagnosis before February?

Mr. STEWART: What was the answer?

Mr. WRIGHT: The witness has stated there was a vesicular disease and it was necessary to have a diagnosis to determine the particular vesicular disease that it was.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: But he did not say that he had not made any diagnosis.

Mr. WRIGHT: He has stated he made no diagnosis until February?

The WITNESS: Laboratory diagnoses, sir.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Laboratory diagnoses?—A. That is correct.

Q. A laboratory diagnosis is necessary to determine what the vesicular disease is?—A. Field tests will do it but laboratory diagnosis is considered to be preferable.

Q. There is a letter here of December 15 and it states: "A horse which was experimentally inoculated with material from mouth of a diseased cow so far shows no lesions of aphta or stomatitis."

That horse, not showing any lesions after having been inoculated with the virus of vesicular stomatitis, you would naturally think there would be some suspicion that this was not vesicular stomatitis?—A. That is Dr. James' report is it not, sir?

Q. Yes. You knew of this, of course?—A. I do not think I have read all the reports. I have been so busy on field investigations.

Q. At that time you, as assistant head of the department, did not know that the horse was inoculated or what the result was?—A. I probably knew at the time. I knew the Waas horse had been inoculated but these reports all go to Dr. Christie.

Q. Under the circumstances, do you not think it would have been advisable to have had some confirmation as to what the disease was—on December 12th—A. Yes but the matter at that time was entirely in Dr. James' hands. I had a great deal of confidence in Dr. James being able to arrive at a decision.

Q. Later on it states that a report was made. I have not got a copy of it here but the report was made that this was not—that you did not think this was a more infectious disease. When you made the statement that this was not a more dangerous infectious disease what had you in mind?—A. I think you should talk to the man who made the reports. It is not my report.

Q. It is not your report but these reports are submitted to you?—A. I think you should ask Dr. James.

Q. Very well, we shall ask Dr. James then with respect to that.

There were two horses inoculated on the Waas farm on December 2 I think it was, either the 2nd or the 3rd but the 2nd I believe?—A. That was by Dr. James too.

Q. By Dr. James?—A. Yes.

Q. Why, in your opinion, would those inoculations take place? If I called in a vet. to my farm, having a bunch of cattle that were sick, and if he wanted to take some of the virus that those cattle had and inoculate my horses, it seems to me I would want to know why and I would question him? I would bring him out there to cure my cattle, I think, and not to infect my horses? He would have to give me some explanation as to why he was going to take some virus and infect my horses?—A. No doubt an explanation was given and the owner was quite willing that the veterinarian go ahead.

Q. What would that explanation be, Dr. Carlson?—A. Well, Dr. James probably asked that he run field tests to determine what kind of disease he had; but I suggest you let Dr. James explain the conversation that took place.

Q. What would the inoculation of a horse determine in a case where there was vesicular stomatitis?—A. It would determine whether it was vesicular stomatitis or foot and mouth disease—or it would give some clues at least.

Q. Then there was some doubt? You would say there was doubt in the veterinarians mind as to whether this was a more dangerous disease or not?—A. No doubt.

Q. When he made that test. He was not expecting—we have been told that nobody ever thought of foot and mouth disease and I cannot understand why those tests were made unless there was some suspicion that there was a more dangerous disease—and it was to determine whether that was a more dangerous disease that these test were made.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the witness has three times now stated that these investigations were carried on by the next witness. He is going to be here as soon as you are through with this witness and why not ask him the question? Why ask someone else to commit himself on that information?

Mr. WRIGHT: What I am trying to determine is whether anyone who was a senior official in the department accepted any responsibility for these reports being made.

Mr. STEWART: Why not ask them that?

Mr. WRIGHT: This is a senior official of Dr. James' department. We had Dr. Christie, who was a senior official to Dr. Carlson, and it seems to me that these reports are given by veterinarians and they must go through the hands of some of these senior officials who see them, and must accept some responsibility for them. The responsibility cannot be entirely placed on the veterinarians who make the diagnosis. They send reports and they go through a lot of senior officials' hands who should have checked on them. That is what I am trying to determine—whether any check was made by any senior officials in this department after Dr. James' reports were made as to whether there were

proper precautions being taken and if we are not allowed to determine that, I do not see there is much use in this committee sitting.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I would not say you are not allowed to examine into it, but I do want to point out that the other man is here to give direct evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: You have one more minute, Mr. Wright.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. I was trying to determine whether these reports were actually looked over by yourself?—A. They are submitted to Dr. Christie. I was not connected with the field reports. I was there after the field reports.

Q. Dr. Christie is the man who would be responsible but not yourself?—A. Yes; and then they are submitted to Ottawa.

Q. I was trying to determine who was responsible. Well, when we made inquiries here the hon. minister said we had better wait until the officials from the west came down as they had the answers. Apparently the officials here did not know the answers. I wanted to determine whether the officials out there had. These samples now are being sent through the mails or express?—A. By air express, sir.

Q. By air express?—A. Yes.

Q. That was all I wanted to know.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Might I explain one thing as to procedure? We are fighting the disease out there. Either Dr. Christie or Dr. Carlson must be on the ground. We cannot have the whole staff away from there. It was not possible for both Dr. Christie and Dr. Carlson to be away and it was thought that Dr. Carlson, his assistant, could perhaps give reasonable information to you now. There is not any objection to having Dr. Christie here later, but Dr. Carlson will have to go back to Regina before we can bring Dr. Christie on. We must have someone out there with this disease developing.

Mr. WRIGHT: I think that is a perfectly normal request. Just one further question I want to ask the witness before I finish.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. There have been some questions asked as to whether the provincial people made inquiries or did anything during the early stages of the disease. Now, you say you have been with the department for some twenty-two years in Saskatchewan?—A. That is correct, sir.

Q. Then, you would be familiar with what has taken place in the past in the province of Saskatchewan with respect to contagious diseases?—A. I believe I am familiar with some phases of it.

Q. Well, I have a statement which states that the—"Dominion responsibility for contagious diseases is well established and recognized by all provincial governments". You would agree with that?—A. Yes, under our Animal Contagious Diseases Act we have—

Mr. STEWART: Let the witness finish his answer.

The WITNESS: I was saying under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act we have our scheduled diseases for which we are responsible.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Is vesicular stomatitis one of them?—A. No, it is not scheduled.

Q. Is foot and mouth disease one of them?—A. Yes, it would be, certainly.

Q. The Department of Health of Animals division guards its jurisdiction very strictly—

Mr. STEWART: Now, what statement is this?

Mr. WRIGHT: I am making this statement and asking the witness if it is right or not.

Mr. STEWART: You are quoting somebody else.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am quoting a statement.

Mr. STEWART: Well, I think the committee should know what the statement is.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am asking this witness if that is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Your time is up but I will let you complete this question.

Mr. WRIGHT: "For example, our provincial veterinarian at one time published a statement with reference to what he thought to be a bovine type of encephalomyelitis appearing in cattle in the southwest. When this statement by Dr. R. P. Waechter, the then provincial veterinarian, came to the attention of Dr. N. D. Christie of the Dominion Health of Animals division in Regina, Dr. Christie immediately contacted our deputy minister and Dr. Waechter was called 'on the carpet' and we were very definitely told that contagious diseases and any statements made in connection therewith came under the complete jurisdiction of the Dominion Health of Animals division and that the function of the provincial veterinarians was to report any suspicious cases to them and that any announcement to be made would be made by the Dominion Health of Animals division."

Mr. STEWART: Now, on a point of order, if my friend is going to read from some letter he has got from Saskatchewan I think the committee is entitled to know who it is from if he is reading this quotation and put it before the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not have to put the letter on the table, but I am prepared to say who it is from.

Mr. STEWART: Well, who is it from?

Mr. WRIGHT: It is from the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. STEWART: Well, I think the committee should have the whole letter before it.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is a statement and I am asking this witness whether that statement in regard to what occurred on a previous occasion with regard to a contagious disease was correct or not, and it was not me who started this.

The WITNESS: I am afraid I cannot answer that because I do not know the first thing about the incident in question. I never heard of it before.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. You never heard of it before?—A. No, if you could give me the date of the letter —

Mr. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, he has read part of that letter. I think the whole letter should be put in the record. I think it is only fair it should be. He has a letter from the minister and we would like to know what that letter contains.

Mr. STEWART: On a point of order, I submit that in a committee or in the House where a letter is read and put to a witness as in this case—in any court you would have to put it in and I think my friend from Lake Centre would agree with me and here you are reading part of it which the committee has never seen and there is very valuable information in it. The committee would like to have that information and I think the whole letter should go in. If we are going to read part of a letter I think it should go in.

The CHAIRMAN: I would rule that the letter be tabled.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not submit to your ruling if that is your ruling.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, before you make your ruling, as I understand the rules in the House, which I imagine cover the committee too, I am entitled if I wish on my own to read an extract from a letter and I am not required to submit that man's name, but if the name is submitted voluntarily, as it has been submitted voluntarily this morning, there is nothing in the rules that I know of that requires me to table that letter from which I am quoting a part. The man who is reading himself will take the responsibility as to whether the part he is quoting from the letter is correct, but it is his letter and it is up to him what he does with the letter which is addressed to him personally and not by the committee or anyone else.

Mr. MURRAY: We have a letter from the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Saskatchewan before us bearing on this subject and it is of public interest that it be read by the secretary of the committee to the committee.

Mr. QUELCH: On a point of order, I think the statement made by the hon. member for Assiniboia is correct. The member has a right to read the letter but if he is challenged he must be prepared to vouch for the authenticity of the letter, but he is not required to table it provided it is a private letter.

Mr. JUTRAS: I am not quite sure of the rule, but I recall an incident that took place years ago in the days of the Hon. Ernest Lapointe when a letter was read in the House by the member for North Battleford. She objected to tabling the letter and the minister asked to have the letter tabled. She had read part of it and the ruling was at the time, I believe, that I know she had to produce the letter and lay it on the table. That will be recalled by a few of the members here who will remember this incident. Once a member has read from a letter he should table the letter.

Mr. QUELCH: I want to point out that that member at the time was not familiar with the rules; otherwise she could have objected to tabling the letter.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: On a point of order we were given the same rules as the House, I think, as Mr. Jutras points out, only I know it better than he does because I read a letter and the speaker ruled that I had to table it.

The CHAIRMAN: There was a motion made by Mr. Murray and, I think, seconded by Mr. Sinnott, that this letter that Mr. Wright has and which he has read from be read by the secretary and put into the record.

Carried.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I appeal the ruling to the House and I refuse to table the letter in committee.

Mr. STEWART: Well, there is one document we cannot get.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, before you leave that, may I refer to a ruling in the House the other day on a point of order? The other day when I was asked to table the documents which have been tabled here and tabled elsewhere I read the rule from Bourinot and I am not posing as an authority on rules because I have always maintained that the rules of Bourinot are common sense and if you have a lot of common sense you do not need to be reading the rules all the time and it is common sense, of course, when a man reads part of a letter it ought to be put on the table. If you will read Bourinot, page 251, the first paragraph, starting near the top of the page and read down, you will find the last sentence on the page says that even when it is privileged in so far as the minister is concerned, that if he reads from the document, then he must table it. Even if it is privileged under all the rules of the House, if he reads from the document then it becomes a public document and he must table it.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, again I refer to Beauchesne and in Beauchesne it quotes the precedent that a person does not have to table a letter he has read

in view of the fact that it is a private letter but he has to vouch for the authenticity of that letter but is not required to table it.

Mr. STEWART: I point out this letter or document is neither private nor confidential and I venture to say it is not confidential because I can see the letter from here.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is a private letter whether the hon. member's eyesight is as good as he thinks it is.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Now, Dr. Carlson, in connection with your qualifications, I believe you omitted one thing. Weren't you one of the men who was sent down to Mexico to study this particular disease—foot and mouth?—A. Yes, to observe.

Q. And you spent some time down there?—A. Several weeks—two weeks, I believe.

Q. You were appointed in what year to the Department of Agriculture?—A. 1929, sir.

Q. That was at the time of the so-called "hungry thirties"?—A. That was the start of it, I believe.

Q. And you served then under what is known as the "Bennett regime"?—A. Yes, I believe I did, sir.

Q. And you also knew at that time a very estimable man who was later made deputy, that is, Dr. Barton?—A. I cannot say I was personally acquainted with him.

Q. You knew he headed the Department of Agriculture under the Bennett regime?—A. Yes.

Q. And Dr. Barton was appointed by the Bennett regime as deputy? Anyway, that is of record. Now, these instructions that were issued in connection with the sending in of any tests to the laboratory, those applied under Dr. Barton, didn't they?—A. I would not know, sir. All I can say is that I have understood that we are not to send samples. Where it originated from or where it is in writing I cannot say.

Q. But it had applied for many years before the present Minister of Agriculture became minister?—A. For twenty-three years, that I know of. That has been my understanding; I may be wrong.

Q. Now, you said that there was a great difficulty of diagnosis in connection with this disease?—A. There always is, sir.

Q. And at the start of this disease certain animals having been found diseased were examined?—A. That is correct.

Q. And early in December, from then on, those animals generally on these places that you did investigate began to improve?—A. They recovered, sir. Dr. James' report will indicate that.

Q. That was the general picture as far as you men were concerned, that there was an improvement in the whole situation from early in December on until the end of January?—A. That is correct.

Q. And no new cases for a period of approximately three weeks?—A. I think Dr. James could possibly give you that picture better than I could because he was on the spot investigating.

Q. And you say in connection with this particular foot and mouth disease that there is a great difficulty of diagnosis?—A. Indeed so.

Q. And that there are a number of other diseases akin to it?—A. Quite a number that you could be suspicious of.

Q. Well, it is something the same as with human beings; the doctors often diagnose wrong?—A. There are diseases that are not even of a vesicular nature that will give you symptoms on diagnosis—I mean, tongue lesions and temperatures and so forth.

Q. And you say one of your objects was to make sure there was no false alarm before you found this was foot and mouth disease?—A. It would be fairly serious to diagnose as foot and mouth disease when it did not exist.

Q. Now, from the time that you were first made aware of this disease, did you and the other officials out there take every step possible to stop the spread of it no matter what disease it was?—A. I understand that individual quarantine was put on in each place.

Q. And your whole object at that time was to stop any spread and you took every step necessary as far you knew?—A. That is correct, sir.

Q. And in that you cooperated with the provincial Department of Agriculture—there was cooperation between you?—A. Yes, very close—always has been, sir.

Q. And there were no suggestions from the provincial Department of Agriculture or its officials that you were not doing enough?—A. Not that were brought to my attention, sir.

Q. And the feeling between you and them was harmony and you got on all right?—A. Very well, sir.

Q. And as far as you know, you took every step possible to stop the spreading of that disease no matter what disease it was?—A. I would say so.

Q. And was there any conflict at all between you and the provincial employees?—A. Never at any time that I know of.

Q. They did not come to you, any of them, and say, "Here, you are not doing enough on this thing," or "You are falling down on the job" or anything like that?—A. No.

Q. And you say as far as sending those samples in is concerned, that rule applied in your department many years ago?—A. As far as I know it did. That was my understanding.

Q. And before this present government came into being?—A. We were never permitted to send samples of that nature until we were instructed to do it.

Q. And the same rule applies in the United States?—A. It applies right now in the United States and very forcibly.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, I want to avoid asking any questions that have already been asked, but I want a little clarification on one or two points.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. On December 2 you wrote a report and I want to read briefly from that report. First of all you did outline a situation on the farm and then you had this to say:

However, realizing the danger of relying on a field diagnosis in a disease of a vesicular nature such as this, it was decided to contact Dr. Childs, veterinarian director general, for further advice.

From that could we presume that you had in your mind that Dr. Childs might want to take additional measures, that he might want samples to be sent?

A. Additional measures were taken. Dr. James was instructed to run field tests on horses which he can explain to you.

Q. Then field tests were made on horses December 8, two horses which had developed stomatitis, is that correct?—A. That is Dr. James' problem again. I understand that they did, that they showed lesions.

Q. You would no doubt consider that that in itself fairly well substantiated your feeling that the disease was stomatitis?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there any possibility that the disease, that the disease on the Waas farm might be a different type of disease from what you first saw; is there any possibility of there being two outbreaks there in the same herd, as between

what you first saw and what you saw later on?—A. There is the possibility I suppose that there might be degrees of infection; but that is very technical and I could not answer. Some scientists might believe that theory of two types; but, as far as I am concerned, I don't think so.

Q. Dr. James' report will show that he first thought this was stomatitis and later on, after the inoculation was made on the horses, they did develop stomatitis; is that correct?—A. Yes. Dr. James can explain that to you, again.

Q. I suppose when that happened then you would be inclined to think there might be an outbreak, that the outbreak might be more serious?—A. I knew, of course, what it was then.

Q. I notice on February 16th two horses on the Moore farm, stabled alongside two cows badly infected. I suppose that in itself would confirm the feeling that there was stomatitis?—A. That is quite right.

Q. When you made your report on the 12th was there any other reason then that the disease looked more serious?—A. Yes, on that particular day I saw the pig with foot separations. Up until that time we had had no pigs or sheep infected.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Dr. Carlson, I understand that you are the supervisor in Regina?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are you the supervisor in Regina?—A. Scarcely supervisor, I am assistant to Dr. Christie; and, of course, we all do some supervisory work.

Q. Then you are second in command to Dr. Christie? And second in command to Dr. Wells?—A. No, no, Dr. Christie.

Q. Dr. Christie is above you?—A. Yes.

Q. You take your instructions from?—A. From Dr. Christie, sir.

Q. In other words, he is your immediate superior?—A. Yes.

MR. SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, before I ask any further questions I would just like to make one comment about this letter. The Minister of Agriculture has been asked during this investigation to table many letters which were considered privileged and has done so; but I note that when the vote was taken a few minutes ago, the member for Lake Centre did not vote against the motion to have the letter tabled. I would like to comment on his behalf that he also would like to have this letter tabled that is now in the possession of the member for Melfort.

MR. LAING: Is the honourable member saying that that letter should be tabled?

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. You say that the field diagnosis of vesicular stomatitis is not very satisfactory, is that right?—A. Well, I suppose it can be considered satisfactory, but I would prefer to have it diagnosed in a lab. I understand that in the States they use field diagnosis simply because they haven't a virus laboratory and it is against their law to have one.

Q. You have been an inspector in the packing plants for how many years?—A. Oh, quite a number of years, sir, off and on during the past 23 years. I have been at the packing plants.

Q. Were you the person who established the disease in the Burns' yard?—A. No, sir.

Q. Who is the man who established that?—A. Dr. James was the first man to be called in.

Q. Dr. James?—A. He was in the Burns' feed lot.

Q. The Burns' feed lot, yes.—A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell the committee where you got your instructions or orders not to send vesicular stomatitis samples to Ottawa or Hull?—A. No. As I understand it, I have always understood that we could never send them, but I have nothing to show in writing.

Q. They must follow some regular established rules in the veterinary service?—A. It has been a long time established rule, as far as I am concerned.

Q. But I understood you to say that it was an established fact that in the case of vesicular stomatitis samples would not be sent by air or in any other way?—A. No vesicular disease.

Mr. SINNOTT: That is all.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like Dr. Carlson to tell the committee what training he himself has had with regard to foot and mouth disease, he was in Mexico two weeks about a year ago. What other training have you had?—A. That is all, except what I got right on the job. You must remember that we have never had foot and mouth disease in Canada.

Q. Did you not attend a course about a year ago in the Animal Disease Research Institute part of which covered foot and mouth disease?—A. That is correct.

Q. Could you tell us about where that course was and what it was like?—A. It was a short course held under Dr. Mitchell over here in Hull pertaining to various diseases and the submission of specimens.

Q. At that time were any instructions given to the group sitting in on these classes as to the procedure to be followed in sending samples in?—A. How to send them in, yes.

Q. Including foot and mouth disease?—A. All specimens.

Q. Then, why did you feel that it would have been so dangerous to send the samples to Hull laboratory with the knowledge and specific training you had, to send those samples so there would be no breakage in transit?—A. It is just the understanding of the department that there was a possible danger, and I suppose there was—they could be packed, of course, in sawdust.

Q. Did you not feel that the instructions you were given in that course were sufficient that there was very little if any danger of samples breaking?—A. I would think so, yes.

Q. I mean, in transit?—A. Yes.

Q. Well then, why would there be any hesitation in sending samples for proper lab tests if there was little or no danger of those samples breaking on the way down east. We were told that the reason the samples were not to be sent was because there was danger of breaking. If there is no real danger of breakage why were these samples not sent earlier?—A. I work on instructions, and our instructions were not to send samples down here.

Q. Did it at any time occur to you, previous to the middle of February, that the samples should be sent to the Hull laboratory?—A. I would have liked to send them from the first.

Q. Did you enquire from anybody as to whether you might be able to send these samples east?—A. No, I did not.

Q. You felt, yourself, that these samples should be sent, and you inquired of your superior officers?—A. I admit I would have liked to send them.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He didn't say "they should be."

Mr. ARGUE: The witness said—he hadn't finished his statement—that he would have liked to have sent samples.

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. You mentioned Dr. Hewitt having visited the Waas farm with you, did you not?—A. I don't think so.

Q. Did you have Dr. Hewitt visit the Waas farm with you?—A. No, I don't think so. Dr. James might explain that to you—not to my own knowledge.

Q. Did you have any conversations with Dr. Hewitt within the last three months?—A. Oh yes, on many occasions.

Q. Did any of those conversations occur in the month of December?—A. I don't recall. I had met Dr. Hewitt so often that I could not recall any specific date.

Q. Well, in your earlier conversations with Dr. Hewitt after this disease broke out do you remember whether he suggested to you that this might be foot and mouth disease?—A. I do not think he did, sir; I cannot recall that he referred specifically to foot and mouth disease.

Q. When was the first date that the bulls of the federal department in Regina appeared to have something wrong with them?—A. Dr. James can explain that to you. He was on that. I was not. I had nothing to do with them whatsoever.

Q. You were not in the pens where the bulls were at any time during January?—A. No sir.

Q. You do not yourself know when these bulls first— —A. No, Dr. James I think I can tell you about the bulls.

Q. Tell me this, have you any knowledge of the cattle that were ill at the Burns' plant?—A. I never saw the cattle in the Burns' feed lot. Dr. James had that under his control at all times.

Q. Did you see any other cattle there at the Burns' plants?—A. Later on, when I took specimens from the cattle on the Burns' stockyard; that was on February 13th and 14th.

Q. That was the first time?—A. Yes.

Q. That you visited the plant or feed lot?—A. I was in the plant but never back in the feed lot.

Q. Did you see any carcasses exhibiting symptoms of stomatitis?—A. Carcasses, no; I saw tongues with some scars on them.

Q. When was it that you saw these scars on the tongues?—A. Sometime in January, sir; I believe it would be about the middle of January.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I understand that you are talking about something else. I wonder, if as soon as you have finished, the doctor would establish the difference between the feed lot and the holding lots. There is a difference between the two, they are not the same thing.

Mr. ARGUE: I have just one further question, if I may ask that, then I will be finished.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I believe you told the committee when you were first making your presentation this morning that there were only 5 or 6 doctors in the world who knew all or nearly all that could be known about foot and mouth disease?—

A. I believe so. I imagine that would be so.

Q. 5 or 6?—A. Yes.

Q. Are any of these doctors Canadian citizens or Canadian residents?—A. I do not think so.

Q. We have not one of the top specialists in foot and mouth disease in Canada?—A. I would not say so, sir.

Q. When this disease is being studied here who would be considered as the Canadian authority on foot and mouth disease? What authority did we have?—A. I don't think we have any supreme authority; that is, one who is generally recognized on a world wide basis. I do not think there is one in Canada as far as foot and mouth disease is concerned.

Q. When you were dealing with this disease, vesicular stomatitis, when you first diagnosed it, who did you look to for advice as to how to deal with this disease; who did you think would be the veterinarian authority who was competent in this field?—A. Dr. Childs would be my first one, and I would naturally look to him for instruction.

Q. And he himself, Dr. Childs, is well acquainted with foot and mouth disease?—A. You would have to ask Dr. Childs that. I could not answer for him.

Q. You have no opinion as to whether he is an authority on it or not?—A. I have every confidence in Dr. Childs in every respect; but as to whether he is an authority, I would rather you ask him.

Mr. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, there was a rule made in this committee that the letter referred to quite a while ago be tabled. I notice now that both the letter and the member who referred to the letter have disappeared from this committee. I was just wondering how you enforce the rules in this committee.

Mr. BRYCE: Mr. Chairman, speaking to this point of order. In leaving the room the honourable member was not running away from anything, he would not run away from anyone here. I rise to assure you he has left the room for a very good purpose. I can assure you he will be back. If you are still on the point of order, I think the chairman should read 316 which deals with it.

Mr. DECORE: The committee decided that the letter should be produced and I think you should enforce the rule, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRYCE: The chairman will take care of the rules.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Laing, and then Mr. Cruickshank.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. Dr. Carlson, the first trouble that existed in the general area was about the first week in December?—A. Correct.

Q. When you were called to the Waas farm there was infection on the Waas farm?—A. Yes.

Q. How many private veterinarians are there in the general area?—A. What do you mean, sir, by the general area?

Q. Well, the general area in which the outbreak occurred?—A. There are four practicing private practitioners in Regina, and one just outside.

Q. There would be others in the area included in this buffer zone as well as the quarantine area?—A. Oh, yes indeed, sir.

Q. At any time did any private veterinary suggest to the departmental officials that the disease was more serious than stomatitis?—A. Not to me, sir.

Q. And you have heard of no suggestion by private veterinaries regarding it as indicating something more serious than stomatitis; in other words, the private veterinaries were of the same opinion as the departmental officials, that it was stomatitis?—A. I would think so, that is my impression.

Q. Looking back now, is it your private opinion—you don't need to answer this if you don't want to—that it was originally foot and mouth disease or did you think it might very well have been stomatitis at that time, and when we had the attacks later in February?—A. No, I think that it was foot and mouth disease in a very, very mild form.

Q. You did think that it was foot and mouth disease in December?—A. But very mild.

Q. Could it possibly have been more than stomatitis, or foot and mouth disease?—A. I don't think so.

Q. You think it was foot and mouth disease from the moment of the outbreak?—A. I think we have to admit that now.

Q. Would you agree with me that at the present time your sole duty, apart from it being down here, is to concentrate on the disease and its eradication?—A. That is right, sir; and we will do that.

Q. I would like to discuss with you, if you would be agreeable, some aspects of the regulations—and if it is embarrassing to you I will not press it—would you be prepared to do so?—A. I may not have the full story about all the regulations, or the investigations that were made, and so on; but Dr. Childs and Dr. Christie will clear you on that.

Q. I only say that because I think this committee and the people of Canada would like to be assured that every possible measure is being used to contain the outbreak.—A. We feel sure that every possible measure is being taken, sir.

Q. Now, we had some evidence previously that an outbreak—I think that it was at Ormiston—had been due to a quarter of beef which had been frozen for some time and released to a farmer who took and either canned it or used it and the bone was thrown out, and it was suggested that the bone in the yard lead to the start of the disease in that area; do you think that is entirely possible?—A. Yes, that is the main evidence there, that was the only possible clue which presented itself at the time. Now, it is not conclusive it is rather circumstantial.

Q. When the minister spoke the first thing this morning we had reference to another outbreak in the Weyburn area, apparently due to an infected calf. Can you assure us that the enforcement of the regulations are such at the present time that there will be no trouble with calves and there will be no shipments of quarters of beef and bones and meat and the like; that the regulations at the present time are adequate to cope with that sort of thing?—A. Every precaution is being taken to apply these regulations. You will have to make allowance for the possibility of human error.

Q. That is right.—A. And somebody may make a mistake, but it would be unintentional.

Q. There is no room today for the movement of infected stock from one herd to another herd in the area?—A. There is no possibility of that being done in the quarantine area, but in the buffer zone I understand they can go by permit after rigid inspection.

Q. What about the transfer of food shipments?—A. There is no marketing of them; as a matter of fact, the quarantine of stock is very rigidly enforced.

Q. And both quarantine and control are in the hands of the police for enforcement, is that right?—A. Yes. The R.C.M.P. are giving us police patrols. On the infected farms now we place our own guard.

Q. You are familiar with packing houses?—A. Yes.

Q. Do any of these packing houses put any scrap or manufacture bone meal?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And are they shipping out any of that material at the present time?—A. No.

Q. No shipments are permitted of meal or beef scrap?—A. There are shipments permitted of certain things which are considered safe as the result of sterilization.

Q. Let's get down to that. Have you permitted the shipment of bone meal or beef scrap from parts of the country where foot and mouth disease has been active?—A. None.

Q. Why?—A. Because of the possibility of introducing it.

Q. Even that which has been sterilized, and so on?—A. Dr. Childs can answer that better than I could.

Q. But you know they are permitted?—A. That is right.

Q. Would that be on account of the jute packing more than the contents?—A. I think it would be on account of both.

Q. But nevertheless you have seen instances where authority has been given for the shipping of these materials?—A. Only certain types of materials are permitted to be shipped.

Q. Beef scrap and bone?—A. I did not say they are permitted. I wouldn't be sure. I haven't been on that.

Q. Is there any raw bone meal ground in any of these plants?—A. Yes, in a few, I think.

Q. Is that being shipped out today?—A. Not from Regina.

Q. It is being retained right within the plant?—A. That is right.

Q. Within the area—well, I would like to make sure; I think the committee, and I am sure the public today want to know that every possible measure is being taken to contain this thing and to eradicate it, including the transfer of meats, and so on. Now, you don't need to answer this if you don't want to. I put it to you that possibly you might have thought there was going to be very little gained or it was not assisting your campaign not to establish provincial embargoes. You do not need to answer. But it seems to me that those who are concerned with the setting up of provincial embargoes and so on would like to be assured that every possible measure is being taken to contain the disease and eradicate it. But you are satisfied?—A. I am satisfied that is the case.

Q. How many veterinaries are there now occupied in control?—A. Somewhere around 60 veterinarians at various times.

Q. And you have the assistance of the police so far as transfer of things are concerned? How is that working out?—A. Very good, sir.

Q. And then I wanted to ask you this, how many policemen are you using?—A. I would not know that, sir. I would not know just how many police there are. Every detachment is alerted and then there are specials put on.

Q. Every possible measure is being taken, to the best of your knowledge, and there is no doubt about the cooperation between federal and provincial men in this regard too?—A. There has been wonderful cooperation right through.

Q. To see that this thing is eradicated?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cruickshank.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the witness. He is by far the most intelligent we have had appear before this committee yet. There is one thing I cannot understand about this container business. I do not know what form the container takes but I do know that at Chalk River we ship stock which contaminates if it were just touched. But we shipped it. So why they could not ship some of this stuff safely down from Saskatchewan I don't know. Now, with respect to Saskatchewan I read in *Maclean's* about the stuff there—I am not going to give you names—there were some people who brought liquid in in ordinary bottles and it did not break. However, I was asked to speak on behalf of the member for Westminster and the member for Burnaby-Richmond, and for the Fraser Valley, because they represent some 90,000 to 100,000 head of cattle, mostly in dairy herds. We produce about 90 per cent of the milk consumed or produced in the province of British Columbia and what we are concerned with, and the people whom we represent are concerned about, is not so much what happened in the past; but I am speaking on behalf of these other members too—we are not lawyers and we are not diagnosticians or druggists—we represent the dairy operators of the province of British Columbia. I for one, am speaking for them. They cannot speak for themselves as they are not members of this committee but we do represent them. We are not lawyers, we are not bankers, we are not drunkards or anything else, but we represent these dairymen in the province of British Columbia. We realize and we believe that there has been gross negligence in the past and we want to know what is going to be done here, but what we are interested in is much along the lines of what Mr. Laing said—we want

to know about the Fraser valley. I realize we have no figures on it but we want to know if there are any precautions being taken that there will be no spreading in the province of British Columbia. The east can speak for itself and we are not sure that those precautions have been taken in view of what the witness has just said.

If our information is correct, feeder cattle were shipped in from a certain prairie province to the Fraser valley in the last two or three days. We do not think under present conditions that that should ever have happened. We had the assurance of the minister last night that it would be discontinued as of that hour but what we are particularly interested in now is if in your opinion—and very much along the lines of what Mr. Laing said; I am not going into technical details—but are you satisfied—as we understand it, you are the only man in Canada who has any knowledge at all of this foot and mouth disease; certainly the witness before did not know whether this was foot and mouth disease or T.B. as far as I could understand it—from your information you are satisfied that every possible precaution is being taken now to prevent the spread to the province I represent, British Columbia?—A. I do not think any further precautions could be taken. I can assure you of that.

Q. The other suggestion that I had is from Mr. Alex Mercer, whom the minister knows, who happens to be general manager of the largest co-operative dairy in the Dominion of Canada. I got this last night. They said: "For God's sake it has happened, the damn disease has happened and it has spread and is spreading. Don't let it spread any more and get men such as the witness you have now to keep it where it is now in Saskatchewan. See it does not spread any further."

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Dr. Carlson, when a veterinarian takes a test to determine a certain disease, can he take a test without suspecting another disease?—A. Oh, certainly.

Q. Now, you were saying about this Waas farm. I thought you said something that we would have to admit possibly it was foot-and-mouth disease on that farm. Now, did you take a test or someone take a test of those two horses?—A. That was Dr. James.

Q. Did these horses react?—A. That is right, sir.

Q. Can a horse take foot-and-mouth disease?—A. No.

Q. They must have had stomatitis then?—A. Unless the reaction was most unnatural. As I understand, field tests have a weakness; things can go wrong with them. What happened in this case I am not prepared to say.

Q. Well, you suspected stomatitis because of these horses?—A. That is right, sir, and that allayed all fears that it was anything but stomatitis.

Q. Now, these United States vets coming up here, I am quite interested in what you said a while ago. Did they say you had taken all precautions necessary and that you had done everything possible that could be done at the time?—A. Yes, I heard no criticism at all, sir.

Q. Because, there may have been some stomatitis there, as far as I am concerned, even though we had foot-and-mouth disease, I would suppose. Now, if sabotage was intended would not that be a good place to start with the foot-and-mouth disease where you had stomatitis?—A. That would be a good way of spreading it indeed.

Q. Because it would stop any fears of foot-and-mouth disease where you had stomatitis?—A. Yes.

Mr. FAIR: In connection with the statement about feeder cattle being shipped into British Columbia from Alberta, I read in the *Citizen* this morning that those cattle were shipped in from northern Alberta and when they left

our province they were destined for immediate slaughter at Vancouver. This statement has been made by Mr. Longman, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Alberta, and he also stated that as soon as they cross the Alberta-British Columbia boundary, then it is the responsibility of the British Columbia government, but they were not sent from Alberta as feeders.

By Mr. Cardiff:

Q. I would like to ask the witness one or two short questions. You made a statement a while ago that your instructions were not to send samples for tests. You made the statement that you were not supposed to send any samples for testing?—A. That is right.

Q. Do you think it was more dangerous not to send than to send them, as it turned out? Don't you think the fact that you did not send them for at least two months prior to the time you could have sent them indicates that it would have been rather safer, as far as cattle were concerned, to have sent them?—A. Yes, using hindsight, sir, that is correct.

Q. There was not anything happened when those samples were sent? The disease was not spread by sending samples?—A. I hope not, sir.

Q. And you admit that it would have been much better had the samples been sent on the start and you had known exactly what you were up against rather than wait two months?—A. Yes, as I say, using hindsight.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. I have a very short question. I think you mentioned a while ago that our regulations with regard to sending specimens were the same as they were in the United States?—A. That is right.

Q. Well, how do they determine foot-and-mouth disease in the States?—A. They depend only on field tests and then send certain specimens to England and a man takes them over directly—a man carries them on his person and takes them to England. That is what I understand.

Q. The horses are not supposed to react to that at all?—A. They are not supposed to, no, sir.

Q. And yet in one of the first cases you had on December 2, as it was mentioned, two horses were inoculated and they reacted?—A. Dr. James will explain that.

By Mr. Murray:

Q. This is only a small question but I want the size and make-up of this sample. How large a specimen are you required to send?—A. Well, the specimen itself is very small but it is packed in a vial and immediately frozen with dry ice and alcohol, and the unbreakable vials made of plastic are packed in a thermos bottle and the thermos bottle is packed in a carton full of sawdust. You must be very careful in sending those samples because the virus does not live too long if it gets heated. It should be frozen.

Q. Well, I suppose the underlying reason that these are not to be shipped is to provide against train wrecks and plane crashes?—A. I suppose that is the idea and human error, that they may become lost in transit.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. I understand you have been in the department about twenty-two and one-half years?—A. That is right.

Q. You have been assistant to Dr. Christie for the last five years?—A. Yes.

Q. You mentioned in your evidence that you had understood in all the time you had been with the service that it was your implicit instructions not to either take samples of a vesicular disease and send them to Ottawa or any place else?—A. That has always been my understanding, sir.

Q. You do not recall ever having seen it in writing?—A. No, I cannot say I do, that far back.

Q. Did you ever see it in writing recently?—A. I believe it is on our instructions for Animal Health Emergency Organization.

Q. Well, I quote from this letter dated Ottawa, April 18, 1951:

Dr. Childs states very definitely that a diagnosis must be established on the premises where disease is found. Under no circumstances whatever should samples or specimens be picked up for laboratory examination or animal inoculation.

Diagnostic procedures where indicated must be carried out on the premises where disease exists or is suspected to exist.

Now, in your opinion how would it be possible to make a diagnosis if under no circumstances whatever any samples or specimens may be picked up for laboratory examination or animal inoculation?—A. Well, does not the next paragraph tell you that it has to be done on the premises? I think that refers to animal inoculation off the premises.

Q. "Diagnostic procedures where indicated must be carried out on the premises."—A. Well, "they should never be picked up." It does not say they can be picked up on one premises and taken to the other.

Mr. STEWART: Well, on a point of order, I think if the witness wants to see this he can see it.

The WITNESS: I think I have seen it.

Mr. CHARLTON: Well, I would like to see this whole document placed right on the record.

Mr. ARGUE: What is it?

Mr. CHARLTON: It is instructions from the Department of Agriculture, Circular 1951-32, Ottawa, April 18, 1951, and under the signature of "T. Childs, Veterinary Director General."

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Will you read the date of it again?

Mr. CHARLTON: April 18, 1951, and it is "To all Canadian veterinarians." I myself received it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, there is no objection to every member of the committee having a copy of that.

Mr. CHARLTON: Well, there should not be any objection, Mr. Chairman, because it is an issue from the department and I think it should be on the record as long as I have it returned, please.

The CHAIRMAN: That can be done, I understand.—(See Appendix A)

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Now, you have said, Dr. Carlson, that you should take a lab diagnosis to confirm the disease?—A. That is my personal opinion.

Q. Well, after all, that is worth a lot. You do not know—at least you have said that you did not know—where the instructions came from that these samples were not to be picked up?—A. Not previous to this.

Q. You said that Dr. Christie had been informed not to send samples in. I understood you to say this morning that Dr. Christie had been told not to send samples in?—A. Well, he would have this circular that you got.

Q. You think that is the only place he got that information? You do not know any other place where he got the information?—A. No.

Q. You also said that sometime during your questioning you were not just satisfied that a proper diagnosis had been made at the start. Now, you have since confirmed that by saying you are now satisfied that it was foot and mouth disease that was in the Waas herd?—A. I think so.

Q. You are satisfied on that?—A. I am, personally.

Q. Now, these two horses, or at least the pigs, you said there was no infection in pigs until February 12?—A. That is when it was first brought to my attention.

Q. That is the first time you had seen pigs infected?—A. That is right.

Q. Dr. James reported one infection on January 19, but you did not know about that?—A. Did not hear about it, sir.

Q. What would you think had you seen a report come in with the word "aphthous" mentioned on it?—A. Aphtha fever is another term for foot and mouth disease.

Q. And if you had seen that report you would have probably been a little more fearful?—A. The word "aphtha" itself does not mean "foot and mouth"; it means mouth, I think. "Aphtha" itself does not mean foot and mouth disease.

Q. Well, on two occasions "aphthous" was used—I do not think this is proper for you—"aphthous condition" and this was under date of December 14 and the next on December 14 again, which is referred to by Dr. James again—"lesions of aphtha or stomatitis."—A. But the word "aphtha" itself, you very seldom hear it.

Q. Yes, other than referring to foot and mouth disease, is that not correct?—A. That is correct.

Q. So that the person who used that term obviously must have had something in his mind or he would not have used that term. As I understand it, you have been instructed not to use the words "foot and mouth disease," is that true?—A. That is true.

Q. Who gave you those instructions?—A. I cannot even say that, sir, except that we have always been cautious about it.

Q. About using the words "foot and mouth"?—A. Yes, it is just an understood fact; I cannot produce it in writing. I think it is just common sense.

Q. Well, of course, as has been mentioned here, hindsight is a lot better than foresight, but don't you think in your own mind that it would be better to have used it and discovered the disease at the time, even though it would cause a lot of trouble and it had been a mistake—even it would be better to have perhaps had a mistake and have caused some economic difficulties than to have waited for two and a half months to prove that it was foot and mouth disease with the impending difficulties and seriousness of the situation that could be brought on in that two and a half month period?—A. I am not sure about that. I think this so-called delay in diagnosis had very little to do with the spread of the disease around Regina, if anything. I think you can trace back now. I think Dr. Wells has a chart where you can trace back on all but four premises to the original infection like links in a chain.

Q. It was your report, Dr. Carlson, as I understand it, where the first outbreak was around Weyburn district, I believe, your case of the bone?—A. That was at Ormiston.

Q. That was your own report?—A. That was my own observation. But it is not conclusive that that did the trick. It was the only clue and it is an interesting clue.

Q. It is possible it did?—A. It is quite possible.

Q. Is it possible that the disease could have been diagnosed early in December?—A. No, I do not suppose that outbreak could have been then. I would not know.

Q. Now, I understand there were two horses inoculated on December 3—one on December 12 and one February 12, and then, of course, there were the two horses and two calves inoculated on February 18 or 17—around

that time. Now, on those inoculations only the first two animals that reacted gave a positive reaction, is that not true?—A. What date was that, sir?

Q. December 2.—A. Yes, as far as I know.

Q. They were the only two horses that gave a positive reaction?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. What in your mind happened in the case of the one inoculated on December 12 and the other one inoculated on February 12?—A. Who did these inoculations—Dr. James? In December, was it?

Q. I presume it was Dr. James. I am looking it up; I presume it was.—A. Well, looking back, I guess we had foot and mouth disease then.

Q. But having had no reaction would not that be suspicious to you?—A. I would think so, yes.

Q. It would, wouldn't it?—A. Yes.

Q. On another case there were two horses standing right beside two cows definitely infected with the disease and those two horses did not show any symptoms. That was early in January, I believe, that the two horses were standing right beside the two cows who were showing very great signs of infection, very good signs, and the two horses standing in the stalls right next to them never had shown any signs of infection. Would that not lead you to believe that it was also foot and mouth?—A. It would be suspicious.

Q. Then on February 12 did you not make a telephone call to Dr. Hall in the office?—A. Yes.

Q. For which we are very thankful now, Dr. Carlson, because had it not been for that telephone call the disease might not have been diagnosed as yet. You did make that telephone call and I understand that you intimated to Dr. Hall that the disease was now in your opinion getting worse and that you thought something should be done?

Mr. STEWART: On a point of order, I do not think this is a proper question. The questioner is a veterinary himself and he makes a long statement which is not evidence. If you would ask the witness questions it would be all right, but you are making a long veterinarian statement yourself as an authority and then you are putting it to the witness and then you are putting it on the record and then you are letting the witness make a short statement.

Mr. ARGUE: We have had ten statements in this committee that were not ruled out of order.

Mr. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the witness if he did make that remark.

The WITNESS: Yes, I did.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. What did you say in that telephone call, would you mind telling us?—A. I told him I was alarmed.

Q. Did you know at that time that Dr. Childs was out of the office?—A. No, I did not.

Q. Did you direct the telephone call to Dr. Childs or to Dr. Hall?—A. To Dr. Childs.

Q. And you had no information—that was the first time you saw Dr. Childs in Regina after the disease outbreak?—A. I do not recall the date. I cannot recall the date that he came but it was early in February, about February 16.

Q. Was that the first time you saw him?—A. I saw him in January.

Q. You saw him in January?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not see him earlier than that?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. And you did not at any time, you were not at any time interviewed by reporters or the minister, for instance, or anyone where you could have said that you were a little bit suspicious of foot and mouth disease?—A. No, indeed not.

Q. At no time previous to February 12?—A. That is right.

Q. Were you ever suspicious?—A. I was suspicious on February 12.

Q. Dr. Carlson, you sent in a report on December 2, that is, the first day, and the report has been quoted before:

Realizing the danger of relying on a field diagnosis of such a nature as this, I decided to contact Dr. Childs.

And I must ask you in all fairness were you afraid right then or you would not put that in your report?—A. I was dubious until Dr. James got the blisters on the horses and then my fears were allayed when those blisters appeared.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Charlton, before you go any further would you kindly refer to the particular page or the number or answer so that the reporters can get it, please?

Mr. CHARLTON: No. 1 report of December 2 at the bottom of the page.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Now, another question, Dr. Carlson, you have had a great deal of experience with foot and mouth disease?—A. Not a good deal.

Q. You have probably had the most of anybody in Canada?—A. I don't know.

Q. You were in Mexico, you took a short course and so on?—A. I would like to say, though, that in Mexico I was not studying lesions of the disease.

Q. You did study methods there, quarantine and eradication and so on, which have been very helpful? Ordinarily, Dr. Carlson, how long do you expect it would take for the positive symptoms to show up in a horse inoculated with this virus?—A. Two or three days, I would say.

Q. On the first test after the horse was inoculated on December 3 and nothing showed up until December 8, could that have been anything else that caused those reactions?—A. It is quite possible. Looking back it is quite possible.

Q. I asked you before, Dr. Carlson, if you saw the minister when he was in Saskatchewan at all?—A. In February, yes I saw Mr. Gardiner in February.

Q. Early February?—A. I cannot recall the date. It would be late February.

Q. You did not see Dr. Childs there until January 7?—A. That is right.

Q. Dr. Childs did not go out there at all or do you know if he contacted Dr. Christie?—A. I would not know. I did not see him out there.

Q. Would you say that horses on the premises would be good subjects to inoculate for diagnosis?—A. Not necessarily. You would have to establish whether they had had it before or had any immunity.

Q. Was that done?—A. No, but the scars on the tongue would tell you. A careful examination of the horse would tell you whether it had had it recently or not by the scars on the tongue which are difficult to determine but it can be done.

Q. But you are not sure whether that was done or not?—A. I am not sure, no.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: As a matter of privilege, the question was asked the doctor as to whether he saw me and the doctor suggested he saw me on one occasion and then it was indicated that he saw me in February. Then he says he was not sure of the date.

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. Is it not correct that the only time you saw me was when I was there and interviewed the packing house men?—A. That is right.

Q. That was after we discussed the matter in the House on the 3rd, 4th and 5th of March. I went to Regina after that. You remember the last day

in the House I said that I was going to Regina. I went to Regina and the first occasion upon which the doctor saw me was when I was out there on that occasion. You did not see me before going out then, doctor?—A. That is right, sir.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. I only have one question. I think you said that the delay in diagnosis of this disease had very little to do with the spread of the disease around Regina?—A. That is right.

Q. Can you explain that further?—A. Well, if you chase the infection as it originated in Waas' herd, or contacts at other places, the chain was pretty well set up away ahead of the diagnosis by even December 2, when it was first reported. Most of the links of the chain are there before December 2. I think there are only four premises in the Regina area not included in the links of that chain.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. What are those links?—A. I cannot recall. I have them here some place.

Q. Could you give us that information?—A. There was the bones and the one at Weyburn, Mike Delarue. Of course, since this was made out we suspected Albert Clements, R. I. Brickley, J. M. Moore and C. Clark.

Q. Are those all in the Weyburn district?—A. No, in the Regina area, very close to Regina.

Q. Those are the four not in the chain?—A. There is no evidence on those four on how the infection got there.

Q. The Ormiston one was supposed to have been from the Burns plant?—A. That is right.

Q. And it may not have come out of the Burns plant after December 2?—A. Possibly.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Was the bone in a raw state?—A. We are just guessing it was a bone, but it is evidence. When you are tracing down things you have to look for all the evidence you possibly can.

Mr. STEWART: I move we adjourn.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn I want to raise a point of order with regard to the tabling of a letter which I was quoting from. That letter is marked personal and confidential, it is not to myself; it is to a third party and I therefore cannot table the letter.

Mr. STEWART: Well, if it is personal and confidential why has my friend got it?

Mr. WRIGHT: If I made a mistake, it is my mistake and I am perfectly willing to take the responsibility for any mistake.

Mr. STEWART: I will take the word of the hon. member. I mentioned it was not a personal or confidential letter, but he says it was. I am willing to accept the hon. member's word.

Mr. BRYCE: You were reading the wrong letter. I wanted it tabled and it was not personal and confidential but you say it was and if it is to a third party I cannot see how it can be used.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is to a third party and if I should not have used it, I take the personal responsibility for reading it. As far as I am concerned it is very personal but that is the circumstances and, as I said, I cannot and will not table a personal and confidential letter to a third party. If it had been to myself that would be a different proposition.

Mr. STEWART: Have you applied to the third party for his consent and has he refused it?

The CHAIRMAN: I think we had better take that up at the next meeting.

Mr. WRIGHT: With respect to the ruling regarding the table of correspondence it is quite clear. I read from Beauchesne's Second Edition, page 104:

"It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda. On the 18th of May, 1865, the Attorney General, on being asked by Mr. Ferrard if he would lay upon the table a written statement and a letter to which he had referred on a previous day, in assuming a question relative to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, replied that he had made a statement to the House upon his own responsibility, and that the documents he had referred to being private, he could not lay them upon the table. Lord Robert Cecil contended that the papers, having been cited, should be produced; but the Speaker declared that this rule applied to public documents only."

Mr. STEWART: Clearly that rule does not apply here because here a member comes in not with his own letter to claim privilege for that letter, but he comes in with a letter to a third person purporting to be confidential. That rule does not apply to a third person, and the only person who can claim privilege is the person to whom that letter belongs. You are the party bringing the letter which is written to a third party—

Mr. MURRAY: Due to the official character of the letter I think it is out of that category. It is from the Minister of Agriculture to a member of this House and therefore it is a public document.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Just on that point of order. As a matter of fact, even if it was admissible which is most doubtful, rulings have been made in the House. There is a ruling made in the case of Mrs. Neilson and I remember that so well. Later that ruling was revoked and the ruling was not followed. Whatever the ruling may be, the committee has no power anyway and can only report the matter to the House. Under citation number 548 this matter is decided by the Speaker and certainly cannot be decided in the committee—because we say things here which are sometimes unsaid in the House; and the House is in control no matter what the situation is.

There has been considerable discussion about documents in the last few days and personally, on the basis of what the member for Melfort says, I think the rule is very much in doubt as to whether production is necessary. That is not a matter for determination by you, Mr. Chairman, or by this committee, it is a matter for the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Stewart moves that we adjourn. May I suggest four o'clock?

The committee adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

MAY 5, 1952.

4:00 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Before proceeding with the evidence I would just like to advise you that on the mimeograph sheet recording the factual reports of inspections there are two slight corrections which should be made in the chart which gives details of the infected premises and which was read into the record by Dr. T. Childs.

A mimeograph copy of this chart is in the hands of each committee member and it may be desirable for each to correct his copy:

1. With reference to Mr. L. T. Waas, the record should indicate that this herd was examined by Drs. Hunter, Carlson and James on December 2nd.

Number 2. With reference to Mr. H. Barre, January 23rd, the report should read as follows:

"Following report by Dr. Hewitt, Dr. James, accompanied by Dr. Dosch, Dr. Hewitt's assistant" etc. You will note that this is a substitution of Dr. Hewitt's name for that of Dr. Hunter which was inadvertently typed on this report.

Dr. E. E. Carlson, Assistant District Veterinarian, Regina, Saskatchewan, recalled:

The CHAIRMAN: Now, are there any more questions for Dr. Carlson?

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. I have just two or three questions arising out of the examination. What are the three main virus types of hoof and mouth disease?—A. I think they call them A, O and C.

Q. And there was an outbreak in Britain was there not, in November?—A. I understand there was.

Q. Yes, and you immediately got a report of that; you get reports of the outbreaks of foot and mouth disease anywhere in the world, do you not?—A. Dr. Childs would, I imagine.

Q. It didn't go to you?—A. We would hear about it in the ordinary course of events, sir.

Q. Yes, and the outbreak in Britain was of what variety?—A. A, I believe.

Q. Of A; and that is a very virulent form of the disease, is it not?—A. Well, it can be very virulent sometimes, I think it is not generally.

Q. What was the nature of the outbreak here in Regina?—A. Type A, sir.

Q. Pardon me?—A. Type A.

Q. Now I am reading from the London Times of April 13th, and I just ask you whether this is correct, it says, the disease broke out in Germany in or about September or October and now was it quite a serious outbreak?—A. I am not sure, but that is my understanding.

Q. But you knew there was an outbreak there that swept Germany, the low countries and France during August, September and October of last year?—A. That is correct.

Q. That is right?—A. That is correct, yes.

Q. And then I ask you about this A virus. Do you know whether or not it was an outbreak of very potent and virulent characteristics? Is that correct, or not?—A. The one in England, you mean?

Q. Yes.—A. I understand it was quite virulent over there.

Q. Now, I will read you this; the outbreak was the A type virus with the unusual characteristics. The outbreak began on November 14th, on the east coast, it was clear that this was of the same type as the German epidemic—that too, was an A virus type in England?—A. Yes.

Q. And the A virus was the virus in Regina, is that correct?—A. That is correct, yes.

Q. Normally the outbreak in Mexico—what was the type in Mexico?—A. Type A, sir; but they had one outbreak of type O in Mexico.

Q. Pardon me?—A. They had one herd in Mexico with type O at the same time.

Q. Yes, it mentions that too. Now, if it had not been that Dr. Childs had gone on a vacation there had no suggestion up to that time that there should be a sample taken; not until Dr. Childs went on vacation?—A. That is correct.

Q. And as soon as he went on vacation did you get a message from Dr. Hall?—A. That is right. I think that evidence was brought out this morning, sir.

Q. And up until the time Dr. Hall phoned there was no suggestion by you or anyone in Regina that this might be foot and mouth disease, was there?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. And you knew, did you not, that Dr. Childs was very opposed to any samples being shipped?—A. I would not say he was very opposed to it.

Mr. STEWART: Just a minute now. I think the witness should be allowed to complete his answer.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: All right.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Did you ever phone Dr. Childs?—A. On the 3rd of December, sir.

Q. Pardon me?—A. Dr. Christie phoned him on the 3rd of December, I didn't phone him personally.

Q. Were you present at the time of that phone call?—A. Yes, I was.

Q. What part of the conversation did you hear? You heard what Dr. Christie said, or part of it, on that occasion?—A. I can't recall the exact words, sir, except that we desired some assistance out there and we also informed Dr. Childs of the situation and to get instructions as to how to carry on from there.

Q. Was there any suggestion made at that time, Dr. Carlson, that there should be a specimen taken?—A. No, not to my knowledge.

Q. Now, did you talk it over with Dr. Christie at the time, in January, as to whether samples should be taken?—A. I could not say that we specified that samples should be taken. We discussed the possibility of getting a proper diagnosis.

Q. Of getting a proper diagnosis?—A. Yes.

Q. Now to get a proper diagnosis you would have to take samples, that is the usual practice?—A. The usual practice, yes.

Q. Well, when was it that you and Dr. Christie discussed together the need or the desirability of having a proper diagnosis, was that early in January when that took place?—A. I would say in December we talked that over.

Q. All right then, it was in December; that would be about when in December?—A. The day we made the phone call would be about the first.

Q. Pardon me?—A. The day we made the phone call to Ottawa was December 3rd, I believe.

Q. Now then did you after that date discuss with Dr. Christie the desirability of something being done to secure a definite diagnosis?—A. Oh, no doubt we did on several occasions, probably on numerous occasions.

Q. Now, is it not a fact that the only thing that held you back was the fact that you had no instructions from headquarters in Ottawa and that you had to wait in order to confirm a proper diagnosis?—A. Yes, with respect to the collection of samples.

Q. Yes, and that would be the only sure way of making an analysis and in that way determining what the disease was?—A. The only sure way, yes.

Q. Because of the fact that no one dared—no one mentioned foot and mouth disease—these inspectors, they went from farm to farm; they went from farm to farm trying to investigate this matter and see what was taking place in January and also in December, they visited different farms?—A. That is right, Dr. James did that mainly.

Q. Pardon me?—A. Dr. James was attending to that.

Q. And were you not also to some extent?—A. No, I was not.

Q. I thought there was a correction made by the chairman a moment ago that you were out to one farm.—A. I was to one farm, yes.

Q. Well, were you in the Burns' company plant at Regina?—A. Yes.

Q. And did you not go out to the Waas farm?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And is it not a fact that it is very, very easy for a person to carry this disease from place to place?—A. Without taking the usual precautions, yes.

Q. And what other precautions did you take after leaving the Waas farm?—A. We wore rubber boots.

Q. Pardon me?—A. We wore rubber boots and cleaned them thoroughly, by disinfection.

Q. And do you wear rubber boots at all times?—A. Indeed we do, sir.

Q. Pardon me?—A. Indeed we do.

Q. When you went out there the first time to the Waas farm did you wear rubber boots?—A. I certainly did.

Q. Now, in Mexico—I have a statement here and I will just ask you whether it is true—in Mexico as soon as you go into a place that is within a 15 mile radius of an infected herd, you go into a farmer's place and the first thing you have to do is to be disinfected thoroughly, both your boots and your clothing; and before you leave the place you have to be disinfected again; is that right?—A. That is correct.

Q. When you leave the farm your boots and so on have to be thoroughly disinfected again?—A. That is right.

Q. And those were rubber boots too, were they not?—A. That is right.

Q. And so wearing rubber boots itself without disinfecting them would not be an effective precaution?—A. That is right.

Q. So that when anyone goes to a farm he has to undergo disinfecting both when he arrives and before he leaves the place?—A. We always disinfect, yes.

Q. Was that done in this case?—A. Yes, we used disinfection.

Q. Where did that take place?—A. The wearing of rubber boots—

Q. Where did you put your boots into disinfectant, was it at the farm?—A. At the farm, sir.

Q. When you arrived at the farm and again when you left?—A. That is right.

Q. And that is the same as is done in Mexico?—A. You don't have to go to Mexico to see that. Wherever an outbreak of such a disease is feared you have to use those disinfecting precautions; you have to wear full rubber clothing, boots, coat and hat, and you have to disinfect thoroughly both before you go on to the premises and before you leave them to guard against the spread of the infection.

Q. To guard against the spread of the infection?—A. Yes.

Q. All right. Just one other sentence: coming back to these bulls in Regina, these prize bulls; did you ever see any of these bulls when they were infected with any disease?—A. No, I did not.

Q. You never went out to them?—A. No, Dr. James was handling those.

Q. Dr. James was handling those; would he not report to you as assistant to Dr. Christie on occasions?—A. To Dr. Christie, his reports would go in through the normal channels.

Q. And that would be the normal channel, through you?—A. No, through Dr. Christie. I look after the meat inspection end of it. Dr. Christie looks after the field end of it.

Q. There is one thing, Dr. Carlson, I would like to find out. There are no documents, no instructions from Ottawa, or any letters from Ottawa, between the 5th of January and the 12th of February. Did not people ever get instructions from Dr. Childs, or any departmental official in Ottawa, during that period?—A. Not that I can recall sir.

Q. You don't know?—A. As pertaining to this particular question, do you mean?

Q. Yes.—A. There is a constant flow of correspondence and reports, sir, of all kinds, as you understand.

Q. Reports would be going to Ottawa?—A. Yes.

Q. But did you see any letters or any instructions in writing from either the deputy minister or Dr. Childs in January or February, between the 5th of January and the 12th of February?—A. I don't recall any at this time, sir.

Q. I see. Now, on the 15th of February Dr. Childs sent you a wire—this is page 24—I understand Dr. Hall in collaboration with Dr. Mitchell had issued instructions for samples; and you got this wire:

Understand Dr. Hall in collaboration with Doctor Mitchell has issued instructions for collection and forwarding to laboratory Hull material from animals suffering from infectious vesicular condition stop those instructions definitely countermanded stop definite diagnosis must be made on premises where disease exists stop understand another horse has been inoculated stop hold quarantines tight and await results horse inoculations stop self on statutory leave when instructions collect material for laboratory examination issued by Doctor Hall stop wire acknowledgment immediately

Was that wire received by Dr. Christie, so far as you are aware?—A. Yes, I would say so, sir.

Q. Did it surprise you that there should be a countermanding of Dr. Hall's instructions about taking these specimens?—A. I suppose I would be a little surprised all right.

Q. Because as you said a moment ago, even in December you knew that in order to determine with finality what the disease was there had to be such clinical examination in Hull in order to determine its finality?—A. Preferably that way, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Two more minutes, Mr. Diefenbaker.

By Mr. Diefenbaker:

Q. Now then, did you discuss this matter with Dr. Christie when these instructions were received?—A. I could not recall the exact words of any discussion, sir.

Q. You were both surprised, expressed surprise?—A. I would not be able to speak for Dr. Christie.

Q. Well, speaking for yourself?—A. I said that I was a little surprised, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Dr. Carlson, before lunch I was going to ask you for some information in regard to these inspections that were made; were you the man who attended to these inspections?—A. I did the investigations on the premises, yes.

Q. I refer to the scraps of meat at this farm where the infection was spread?—A. Yes, I made that investigation.

Q. Do you recall whether these scraps were thrown out to the dogs so that they could carry them around? Were they in a place where the animals could walk over them?—A. They were thrown right out to the dogs, and the dogs carried it around into the barn and all over the place.

Q. And you say these portions, these scraps were infected?—A. They were possibly infected, sir. I was explaining this morning, that it was about the only suspicious evidence we had, it was only a clue which we ran into at the time, but it was interesting and the only clue we got.

Q. Did you inquire where the farmer got the meat from?—A. We made hundreds of inquiries and it was only about on the third day that this farmer's wife suddenly recalled that she had canned this quarter of beef.

Q. You are satisfied that the scraps came from this quarter of beef from this infected animal?—A. Well, that is what they told me, that is about the

only clue we had and while the evidence was circumstantial that is what we concluded.

Q. In any event, that is your view. Now, did I understand you to say before lunch that in the United States there is a law against the laboratory testing of virus specimens?—A. That is what I understand, yes.

Q. And is it a fact, do you know, that there is an act of congress against it there.—A. I do not know about that, I could not say. I believe, however, that there is only one leading diagnostic laboratory for foot and mouth disease and that is at the Research Institute in Great Britain where they carry on practically all the research in that field in the world. It is right in the centre of Great Britain, and I imagine they receive various samples probably from all over the world at that laboratory.

Q. And do I understand you to say that there is an act of congress in the United States against that sort of thing being done there?—A. Definitely, I believe there is an act of congress under which they are not allowed to set one up.

Q. Then, if I understand what you say correctly to have sent those samples to Hull would have been establishing a precedent in Canada for the whole of North America; however, there would be practically no danger in sending these specimens properly packed down to Ottawa by air; I think that is what you said this morning; but it would be establishing a precedent in Canada of something which had never been done before, whether it was right or wrong, in shipping those samples to Hull?—A. I believe so.

Q. In other words, we have a chance now, of finding out these diseases such as we never had before, and which we would not have had if this had not happened?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. Mr. Chairman, my question is along the same line. I was going to ask my question by referring back to the letter of Dr. Childs at page 68, just referred to by Mr. Diefenbaker. If I understand Dr. Carlson correctly, the practice followed in Canada is exactly the same as the one followed in the United States?—A. Up until recently, yes.

Q. And is it not a fact too that the department here, the government, has tried to follow the American system of control very closely.—A. I believe so.

Q. And as has just been mentioned, it is the practice in the United States, there is a definite understanding over in the United States, that no sample, no specimen is to be taken away from any farm?—A. That is right.

Q. And take it to any other place?—A. That is the way I understand it, sir.

Q. Does that not in a way explain the wire from Dr. Childs?—A. I would say so, yes.

Q. And then apparently it was countermanded, and as you said before, it has always been the general policy of the Department not to have samples sent in in that way; I mean, there has been a standing regulation in Canada not to have any specimens taken away from the farm?—A. That is right. There is this point, you must remember with all due respect to all practising veterinarians, if you allowed everybody to procure specimens and forward them to the labs from here and there and all over the country, somebody would make a mistake.

Q. When this wire was dispatched on February 15th, had the specimens left Regina at that time.—A. That is right, sir; they had left by air express on the night of the 14th.

Q. So actually this wire had no practical effect?—A. The specimens were already on the way.

Q. Then, as a matter of fact, the specimens were already under way, the Saskatchewan specimens on which the diagnosis of the disease was finally established?—A. Yes.

Q. And they left there on the 15th of February?—A. Yes.

Q. And it took from the 15th of February to the 25th of February to diagnose the disease in the Hull laboratory?—A. Yes. I might explain that. I don't think it usually takes that long. If I remember correctly, Dr. Mitchell, who made the tests himself, wanted to make a double check to be absolutely certain.

Q. But in any event this wire was just a repetition of a standing order that existed in the country for over twenty years, and in effect the wire had no practical effect whatsoever because it came through too late?—A. None whatsoever.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Mr. Chairman, in the Animal Contagious Diseases Act section 25 says that when an inspector finds an infectious contagious disease he shall report and so on. Would you say that vesicular stomatitis is an infectious disease under that section?—A. It is not an infectious disease under the Act, but it is an infectious disease.

Q. Would you say it is reportable or that it is a disease which should be reported?—A. Not once it is established, no.

Q. Who in your opinion is responsible for the control of vesicular stomatitis?—A. Well, the provincial authorities if they so desire—otherwise I believe that is usually left in the hands of the practitioners and, in response to treatment it usually runs its course.

Q. If it is a disease that is usually left to the provincial authorities and ordinary practitioners, why did the federal authorities stay in the field?—A. We were instructed to do so by Dr. Childs in order to prevent any further spread.

Q. And it was not suggested by you or by anyone else at the time that this disease that broke out early in December should be turned over to the provincial authorities?—A. No.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Under what authority was the Waas place put under quarantine?—A. I think the Act gives you authority to quarantine under any suspected disease—until you more or less establish—

Q. In other words it was quarantined under the dominion contagious diseases act on the authority of the dominion?—A. If Dr. James quarantined it would certainly be under The Animal Contagious Diseases Act because he is employed by that department.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. You mentioned this morning that as far as you know and as long as you had been with the service this sending in of samples ruling had been present?—A. That was my understanding.

Q. That was the reason there had not been any samples sent down previously, as far as you know?—A. That is right.

Q. Here is a bulletin or pamphlet put out by the Dominion Department of Agriculture, bulletin No. 131, written by Dr. A. E. Cameron, Chief Dominion Veterinary Inspector published in 1930—that was just the year after you joined the service was it not?—A. That is right.

Q. Dr. Cameron was since acting Veterinary Director General was he not?—A. Correct.

Q. This pamphlet written by Dr. Cameron has on page 8 full and concise information as to how such specimens or laboratory tests should be taken?—A. Yes.

Q. Full and concise information there. Admitting it is dangerous the details are here as to how they are to be taken and how they are to be sent in. Now, in your opinion, Dr. Carlson, was that a very dangerous procedure, actually?—A. Not under proper care, no.

Q. I mean in view of the fact that we send so many things by plane these days—much more dangerous things than this virus?—A. I think that point was brought out this morning, sir.

Mr. LAING: By Mr. Cruickshank.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. So it is not as dangerous as it might be presumed that it was—to take a chance on sending these samples in according to this? As I understand it Dr. Cameron was veterinary director general until Dr. Childs took over in 1946?—A. That is true.

Q. Having written this pamphlet do you think that Dr. Cameron would have had the objection to having these samples sent in that Dr. Childs appeared to have?—A. I am not certain—but apparently not.

Q. Well, having sent out instructions or having written the book and described in detail how they were to be taken, naturally you would expect it?—A. That is right. I imagine any instructions or rather any specimens sent under those instructions would be done by a special order. You would not do it haphazardly by yourself.

Q. Of course not, and there is definite restriction as to what a veterinarian or inspector who is doing the work shall do?—A. That is right.

Q. It is obvious, as you stated a moment ago, that if every veterinarian was allowed to take samples that would be most dangerous?—A. Certainly.

Q. Now, Dr. Carlson, you said this morning that you were essentially in charge of meat inspection at the plants?—A. That is right.

Q. That is your part of the job. Do you see all these reports that are sent in?—A. Those reports go directly to Ottawa—the 16/21's you are dealing with are mailed by the inspectors directly to Ottawa.

Q. You do not see them at all?—A. Unless I happen to go over to the plant and have a look at them.

Q. Unless you happen to go have a look?—A. That is right.

Q. From the time the quarantine was put on the Burns plant on December 28th, were you advised at any time between then and the 12th of February when you were asked to send samples to take any inspectors in that plant and check over any of those lists?—A. Oh, indeed.

Q. Were you at any time advised of any particular part of a body that was condemned?—A. Yes, I was.

Q. Mind you, I do not profess to know anything about these things, having never worked in a plant—I would not know. What do you mean by the term "stomatitis heads"?—A. That would be an inflammatory area involving the mouth.

Q. Around the lips, inside the cheek?—A. Yes, any place in the oral cavity.

Q. "Stomatitis tongue"?—A. That would mean a scar or some definite inflammation.

Q. "Erosion tongues"?—A. Erosion tongues are very common—caused by barley beards and many things.

Q. Any scar?—A. Yes, erosion means what it says—slight erosions.

Q. "Stomatitis heads" and "stomatitis tongues" would mean scars presumably caused by stomatitis?—A. By inflammation.

Q. Would stomatitis ordinarily cause as much inflammation as foot and mouth disease?—A. Oh, yes, some stomatitis would cause far more.

Q. Are the scars as deep in stomatitis?—A. Yes—but they heal very rapidly.

Q. In the case of stomatitis?—A. Stomatitis or foot and mouth disease.

Q. Which scar would be the deeper of the two—that in stomatitis or in foot and mouth disease?—A. I would say stomatitis. Using it as a general term, the word “stomatitis” covers a wide field.

Q. Oh, yes, it is quite a broad term for inflammation of the mouth?—A. That is right.

Q. Ordinary infectious stomatitis, but what I am trying to say is would you say infectious stomatitis would cause a deeper scar to the tongue that would foot and mouth disease?—A. Are you talking about vesicular stomatitis?

Q. Yes?—A. There is no difference in the lesions in vesicular stomatitis and foot and mouth disease. They are indistinguishable to the naked eye.

Q. Then there would not be any particular significance to the fact that there were a good many stomatitis heads and tongues condemned in the plant during that time?—A. We knew we had what we thought was infectious stomatitis or vesicular stomatitis at that time.

Q. There would not be any significance to the fact that there was a good deal of these things condemned?—A. Not a bit. We knew that we had them there and it just fitted in with what we had in the field.

Q. Well, I think I mentioned to you this morning or asked you this morning if it would not have been better to bring these horses in from outside?—A. Preferably.

Q. Rather than taking them from the premises?—A. If I were conducting a field test I would bring the animals from as far away as I could get them.

Q. As far as you know was that ever done?—A. Not in this case but later on it was.

Q. In the tests on December 2nd it was not done, nor in the tests on December 12th—only on February 12th?—A. I understand it was not, although Dr. James will probably clarify that.

Q. It was on the subsequent tests taken on February 17th?—A. Yes.

Q. Another thing, are the animals so inoculated, young animals or old animals?—A. As young as you can get them, sir.

Q. On the premises. The ones inoculated on the 2nd of December, the 12th of December and the 12th of February?—A. You would have to ask Dr. James about that.

Q. It was Dr. James who did the inoculation?—A. Yes.

Q. We will ask him about that.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. I was interested in you saying that you were mildly surprised—was that what you said?—A. I think so, yes.

Q. When Dr. Childs countermanded the sending of this virus?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you not think that could be so ordered when the law for twenty-three years was that this virus was not to be sent. I am thinking of what the press is going to say when you say you were surprised?—A. It is understandable, knowing that the order was countermanded.

Q. That is the point I want to make clear.—A. It was quite understandable.

Q. Why should you be surprised if it was understandable?—A. Naturally, you are surprised or slightly surprised to receive countermanding orders. I do not mean it in the sense that it probably appears.

Q. You could easily understand Dr. Childs' attitude?—A. When you sit down and study the situation you realize how he arrived at that.

Mr. DECORE: My question is along the same lines. Why were you surprised? I am still not clear there.

The practice we have in Canada is the same as that in the United States—that is you are not supposed to transfer these samples from the premises for any distance. Why were you surprised or slightly surprised?

The WITNESS: Well, may I put it this way? When one official of yours issues one order and then another issues another, then naturally you wonder what is going on, don't you? Until you see the daylight you would wonder.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. On that question, you were not surprised at the effect of the order but at the two contrary orders coming within some three days?—A. Which is quite understandable.

Q. Which you understood later and which had no effect on the tests being made or delayed?—A. No.

Mr. HETLAND: Would not the word "wonder" be better than "surprised"?

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Can you tell us how far the Burns feed lot is from the Burns packing plant? There are a lot of different views in the committee as to how close they are?—A. They are contiguous. They have a stockyard where they accept cattle for slaughter and the feed lot is contiguous to it.

Q. Just a fence between them?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. How many vets altogether examined these cattle, that is private, and governmental—both provincial and federal—before this situation developed on the 12th of February to more serious proportions?—A. At least six.

Q. At least six?—A. I would stand correction on that.

Q. That includes the private veterinarians and Hewitt was one of them?—A. I believe so.

Q. He was employed by the provincial government?—A. No, he was a private practitioner. There was Dr. Waechter, Dr. Hunter, Dr. Dosch, and Dr. James.

Q. Up until the time this situation developed seriously late in February they were all agreed that this was not the serious disease, foot and mouth disease?—A. That is my impression.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Did you inspect the animals in the feed lot?—A. No.

Q. You had nothing to do with them?—A. No.

Q. None of those cattle ever went into the plant to be slaughtered?—A. Not until later on.

Q. Tell me what happened later on?—A. Dr. James can tell you about that because as they recovered he released some I believe.

Q. They could have been suffering from the disease if they had been in contact with other animals that did have it—and I am not saying what disease it was—either one disease or the other?—A. Dr. James will tell you what he released.

Q. Yes, but I am asking you as a veterinarian. They could be suffering from the disease although they did not show any symptoms.—A. They could be carrying it.

Q. They could be carrying it?—A. Yes, that is possible.

Q. You said that was possible.—A. I suppose it is possible, yes.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. I am looking at this return called factual data from reports and I presume you are familiar with it?—A. With some of them, although Dr. James did most of the investigation.

Q. In connection with the Burns Company stockyards it states that on January 14:

3 steers and 3 heifers in feed lot showing lameness—appears to be ergotism but no traces of ergot in hay and chopped grain being fed. These lame steers and two of the heifers slaughtered—post mortem examination diagnosed foot rot responsible for lameness.

How was that diagnosed as foot rot? I will just read the whole thing?

On January 17 all animals inspected and in good health. The feet and rumens of a number of cattle slaughtered in the plant showed lesions and were given post mortem examination by Drs. Childs, Carlson, Dryden and James. It was their opinion that foot lesions were caused by *bacillus necroforus*. . .

—A. *Bacillus necroforus*, yes. That is a foot rot infection. It is a common soil borne disease which causes a number of ailments and foot rot is the main ailment it causes.

Q. I was going to ask you how you made the diagnosis was responsible for the lameness?—A. It was just a general opinion. It was not a laboratory diagnosis but it was an on the spot diagnosis.

Q. You made no laboratory tests. You just looked at the carcasses after slaughter?—A. The clinical evidence pointed to that disease.

Q. And you decided it was foot rot?—A. That is right.

Q. Is there anything in the appearance in the foot of an animal which has foot and mouth disease which differs from the outside appearance of an animal that has foot rot?—A. Quite a bit. You learn from experience but it is rather difficult to explain. Foot and mouth is a vesicular condition but foot rot is not. It is just a general inflammatory condition with no vesicles produced. It is obvious to a veterinarian but it is difficult to explain.

Q. And none of those vesicles were apparent in those animals?—A. That is right. If there were any vesicles apparent the diagnosis for foot rot would never have been made.

Q. Going on from there through this thing, there are quite a number of reports further on. Here is one for Alec Duck, and it says: “. . . new cases have developed swellings in the legs and sores between the toes which would appear to be foot rot.” Then there is the report on the dominion livestock division about these bulls. “Four of these animals have symptoms of foot rot and are being placed in a foot bath containing warm water.” Then there is K. Haun. “. . . a few cows exhibited swellings and soreness in the feet above and between the hoofs.” Susequently, “. . . still had sore feet and separation of the hooves at the heel.” Do you ever have a separation of the hoof from the heel with foot rot?—A. You can with any inflammatory condition.

Q. Now, when you got all these cases of animals that were lame and animals with sore feet which you diagnosed apparently in all cases as foot rot, did it not occur to you that possibly it was not foot rot—particularly when taken in conjunction with the vesicles on the tongues of these animals, and so forth?—A. These reports are all by Dr. James and I would rather you direct that question to Dr. James.

Q. It strikes me that all these reports referred to these sore feet which in every case are spoken of as foot rot. I do not quite understand why they were just written off immediately as foot rot instead of being related directly to the vesicle condition that was apparent in these animals' hooves?—A. Inflammation of the foot, sir, will occur in vesicular stomatitis. The foot can be involved frequently.

Q. At any rate this did not make any impression on your mind or make you suspicious that it was foot and mouth disease rather than foot rot?—A. As I say those are Dr. James' comments and I would not like to answer for him.

Q. You saw these reports?—A. Some of them, yes.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. I am asking for some information. I asked some questions on Saturday, I do not know if you were present then or not?—A. No, I was not.

Q. I will go on now with the question I asked then about this beef that was shipped from the Burns plant on the 25th of January to Vancouver. From the information I am given it was distributed to the general public. That does not mean a thing in the world. What I would like from you, sir, in your opinion would it be possible to spread this disease from the 6,120,000 pounds and 2,800,000 pounds of beef liver? This was distributed after the first fear of foot and mouth disease from Regina from the Burns plant on the 25th of January?—A. Highly improbable, I would say, sir. Possible but highly improbable.

Q. But possible?—A. Your spare ribs have no bone marrow.

Q. Not spare ribs—beef liver?—A. I would say no.

Q. Now, the information given in the last session was that a piece of raw meat thrown out—A. Well, that is possible, but do you think a piece of raw liver is going to be thrown out?

Q. Is it possible; that is all I am asking for your opinion?—A. Yes, possibly, faintly possible.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?

By Mr. MacKenzie:

Q. Just one question I was going to ask. In all this cattle disease, how many actually died as a result of the disease?—A. I believe there is the odd very young calf which is to be expected but mortality has been negligible.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Dr. Carlson, once the disease was diagnosed as foot and mouth disease and while you were waiting for an opportunity to slaughter cattle, were they confined to a barn or yard?—A. Indeed they are confined, to the barn if possible and police control put on.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions? If not, it will give Dr. Carlson an opportunity to get back tonight.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. I have just two questions. You said earlier on December 3 when the horses were tested on the Waas farm there was some discussion as to whether this was a more dangerous vesicular disease than stomatitis. That was why the tests were made?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. And if the horses reacted you naturally thought that in all probability it was vesicular stomatitis?—A. That is right, sir.

Q. And on December 12 another horse was inoculated on another farm?—A. That was by Dr. James, sir.

Q. And those horses did not react to the inoculation. The point I am wanting to establish is, was there any discussion between Dr. James and Dr. Christie or yourself with respect to the fact that those horses had not reacted to the inoculation?—A. Not with me, sir.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Dr. Carlson, when the barns and yards were cleaned out what happened to the manure? I asked that question of a witness before and he said that the manure from the barns and yards of the infected area had been spread across the fields.—A. No, that is not true, sir. It has been burned where possible and buried where possible. You have to size up the situation, the quantity on hand and the means of disposal. Some of those problems are not

just so easy to explain. Every premises is usually dealt with on its own merits. Every precaution is taken to dispose of possible infection.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Do you use power sprayers for cleaning?—A. Yes indeed, we use power sprayers. We were up against a very great deal of difficulty as you will understand, due to the frost and frozen manure and so on, but we had to wait until the weather broke. In the meantime we did a temporary job in a lot of those places and covered up what we could until we could do it properly.

By Mr. Fair:

Q. Does the quarantine require that the farmer and his family and help do not leave the farm until the quarantine is lifted?—A. That is the quarantine we have now, but in the case of Ormiston I personally provided the farmer with groceries, ordered his fuel oil and got the school books for the children from the school, so that he remained on the premises.

Q. I was just wondering if there was a possibility of the farmer or his family or help moving about and carrying the disease?—A. We tried to stop that as much as possible.

By Mr. Major:

Q. If you had taken a sample a few weeks earlier do you think we would have had less spread of the disease or if you had waited for a sample for another two weeks later would we have had more spread?—A. It is hard to estimate. It is hard to guess what would happen; we would only be guessing.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Well, would you have taken any more precautions than you did take? I understand you took every precaution possible?—A. Up until that time, yes, by quarantine.

By Mr. Cardiff:

Q. The question I wanted to ask was, I wondered what compensation was paid for the hens destroyed and fowl and buildings, if any?—A. I had nothing to do with compensation. That was under a special appraisals committee and I am afraid I cannot answer it.

Q. Who would I get that information from?—A. Well, I believe Mr. Coles was the one appraising in Regina, but there was a committee set up under the chairmanship of George Robertson of Regina.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Dr. Carlson, in reply to a question by Mr. Stewart you indicated that every precaution has been taken for quarantine for vesicular stomatitis. Do you mean by that that no more vigorous enforcement of quarantine is implemented in the case of foot and mouth disease?—A. Indeed not, sir. The first quarantine is to prevent the movement of livestock off the farm which is done in any event.

Q. A much more stronger quarantine is put into effect when you know it is not vesicular stomatitis?—A. Yes, there are real teeth in the quarantine put on now.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. And no doubt you would undoubtedly have done it. Had you realized whether it was foot and mouth disease or not you would not have approved the shipment of carcasses exhibiting stomatitis for food consumption?—A. Once foot and mouth disease was established the plant ceased operation entirely.

Q. Very certainly there were other steps you would have taken—more rigorous quarantine in relation to the Burns plant if you had known you were dealing with foot and mouth disease?—A. Certainly.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. But I understand that the provincial authorities with whom you were dealing did not insist on any stronger quarantine than you were putting on?—A. Not to my knowledge, no.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. You said that you and your colleagues were protected by wearing rubber gloves and using disinfectant and so on. So far as you know does that apply to those who were policing those quarantined areas? Were the same precautions taken?—A. When the outbreak was diagnosed everyone had to take these precautions. Even newspapermen and photographers were given a lye bath and so on.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Did it improve the newspapermen?—A. It did not help them a bit.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Was this carried out prior to the finding of this foot and mouth disease? Was that carried out when you thought the disease was only stomatitis?—A. Well, your precautions would not be on the scale they are now. You would have used ordinary disinfectant.

Q. In January and December the police and farmers would not be protected like that?—A. There were no police then. The police were not helping with the quarantine work until the disease was established. We had our own quarantine enforcement.

Q. You people yourselves would not take the same precautions?—A. Not quite so stringent, but we always take precautions. A good veterinarian would always take precautions.

Q. But they were very different from those on that day in February when you were satisfied as to what the disease was?—A. Then they became more stringent, of course.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Were the quarantine precautions taken initially? You have told us they were taken for foot and mouth disease but were they taken under the Act and where did you have your authority in the federal Act to place these quarantine measures if it was not for one of the definitely listed disease?—A. I think you will find in the regulations there where you have any suspected disease that you can quarantine for suspicion until you establish what it is.

Q. Would you take it that section 24 of the Act is the part of the Act under which you establish these quarantine regulations, the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1945—

Whenever an inspector finds or suspects infectious or contagious disease to actively exists, he shall forthwith make a declaration thereof under his hand—

And so on, with regard to quarantine. Would you take it that is the part of the Act under which you use your authority to establish this quarantine?—A. That is right.

Q. So that under the federal Act, infectious diseases do not apply, your authority does not apply merely to those diseases that are spelled out but rather applies to any infectious disease?

Mr. STEWART: Now, the Act speaks for itself. This witness cannot give evidence on the law.

Mr. ARGUE: I think it is a fair question.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. You have authority under the Act to quarantine and take certain steps in regard to infectious diseases other than those diseases specifically mentioned?—A. Sometimes under the Act you may have to exceed your authority a little bit to do the job.

Q. I suggest to the witness that the authority was not exceeded in any way because (c) under section 2 of the Act says:

2. (c) 'infectious' means communicable in any manner;

And then (d) says:

(d) 'infectious or contagious disease' includes, in addition to other diseases generally—

So I take it within this Act as it now stands you have full power to deal with any infectious disease?—A. A fairly supreme authority, I would say.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. In the outbreak before you had determined what this disease was by the test on the horses, you had quarantine. Then, after the test on the horses, I see here when the quarantine was lifted it states in Dr. James' report:

I am now satisfied that we are not dealing with a dangerous infectious disease and would recommend that the quarantine of the owner's live-stock and premises be terminated.

That took place on December 8 and it was much later than that when the Burns plant became infected. There was no discussion as to whether it was your responsibility or the provincial responsibility in regard to placing the quarantine on the Burns plant?—A. Not that I recall, sir.

Q. You went right ahead and placed the quarantine on?—A. I did not, but Dr. James did.

Q. And there was no discussion as to whose responsibility it was?—A. Not that I recall.

Mr. WYLIE: Mr. Chairman, I have not asked any questions today at all—not this morning nor this afternoon, but I am sure that Dr. Carlson has given the Committee on Agriculture a very large amount of useful information—something that we did not have before. He has been on the stand for three hours and I think that the place for Dr. Carlson with his capabilities is back out in Saskatchewan. I do hope that we can let him go soon and get away.

Dr. N. V. James, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been employed by the federal Department of Agriculture, Health of Animals division, since 1929—the same day that Dr. Carlson joined the service—and my activities in the department have taken me pretty well all over Canada but mostly in Saskatchewan—several years in Winnipeg, several years in Saskatoon, several years in Regina.

At the present time I occupy the same position there on contagious diseases. Previous to that I was in private practice for a number of years in Manitoba and in the army for four years in the first great war. I do not know if I can elaborate on that all. In my experience I have had quite a lot to do with

stomatitis. I have had outbreaks of stomatitis, one particular one when I was in practice in Manitoba in horses and cattle. The treatment at that time was the same as the treatment we are administering in Saskatchewan. The animals all recovered without any mortality.

In 1938 and 1939 we had stomatitis in Saskatchewan while I was with the service. These animals were treated in the same way, horses and cattle, and we had no fatalities at all. The animals all recovered so that I became quite familiar with stomatitis.

In the present outbreak, in company with Dr. Hunter and Dr. Carlson on our visit to Mr. Waas' premises, we were convinced that we had stomatitis there. We treated the animals in the same manner and the animals all recovered with no losses whatever. Seven pigs running with the cattle, feeding out of the same trough and at liberty to run anywhere they liked on the farm did not develop the disease, which you would expect had it been foot and mouth disease.

After that the reports will show that the neighbours, Mr. Woods and Mr. Smith came over to assist Mr. Waas in doctoring his cattle when he first called a private practitioner and they undoubtedly carried the infection to their premises. In their cases the animals were treated in the same manner and the animals all recovered without any losses. I was taken off all other kinds of work and detailed to look after these premises by Dr. Christie, my superior officer.

In all the time that we were treating animals there no live animal carried the disease from any premises to any other premises, they never got any infection from one farm to another by animal contact, until we finally discovered we had foot and mouth disease; on the quarantined premises we had several premises where the disease broke out later on with the same results all the way through, we treated the animals and they recovered. A little bit later on we began to get a more virulent type of disease; that is I might say in the case of three or four herds we did not get vesicles on the teats; we did get a little bit of sore foot, which you might get in any herd of cattle in Saskatchewan. We did not have extensive lesions like you would expect to find in the foot and mouth disease; the animals recovered from this foot soreness by being treated with antiseptics. Later on, when we got down to the herd of Mr. Haun and Mr. Duck and Mr. Wagner, we found that the cases were more difficult to treat there. The animals feet became more sore and more difficult to treat, although the treatment of the cases in the animals progressed favourably, it took a little bit longer, but still they healed up, we had a little more trouble healing the feet up. The same was true all the way down the line. We had no doubt, I was quite satisfied that in any herd that had this infection we would put them back in full production—they were feeding well and gaining in weight and gaining in milk production—in 10 or 12 days, or a couple of weeks. On the whole we were pretty well satisfied that we had the animals recovering. That is about all I can say about our efforts along that line.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Dr. James?

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Did you, Dr. James, at any time feel that specimens should be sent in to make a more thorough diagnosis of this disease?—A. Not until it became more difficult to treat them. I was satisfied that we were doing everything necessary.

Q. You are aware, are you though, as a professional man, that it is impossible to tell for certain whether you have vesicular stomatitis or foot and mouth disease without a proper laboratory test?—A. Yes, it is a very difficult thing to determine.

Q. But, certainly, that is the only sure way of making a diagnosis?—A. Yes.

Q. You operate under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, is that right?—

A. Yes.

Q. Are you aware of the provision of that Act, the Act under which you operate?—A. Yes.

Q. And would you say that the power there is under that Act to enforce a quarantine, is based on section 24, which I read a few moments ago; because a disease is an infectious disease therefore quarantine may be used?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you at any time since you made your first visit to the Waas farm and made a report on this disease send in any report directly to the minister; did you report to the Minister of Agriculture directly?—A. I made my report to my immediate superior, Dr. Christie.

Q. Are you aware of the provision of the Act, section 25, subsection 1, which says:

Whenever an inspector makes such a declaration of the existence or suspected existence of infectious or contagious disease of animals, he shall, with all practicable speed, send a copy thereof to the Minister.—

A. I am aware of that.

Q. Why did you not send a copy of your report to the minister as provided in the Act?

Mr. STEWART: It does not say, "directly".

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. ARGUE: It says that he shall send a copy of his report directly to the minister.

The WITNESS: It has never been our custom to do that, we make our reports to our superior officer and he reports to the next in line.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. It has never been suggested to you that in order to live up to the provisions of the Act you as an inspector are required very definitely to send a copy of a report of an infectious disease directly to the minister?—A. Well, we are out in the field and we send our reports in to the officer to whom we are responsible, and he in turn sends it on to Ottawa directly from our head office in Regina.

Q. He sends it to Ottawa, but as I have already pointed out, in this instance it should have gone to the minister, a copy should have been sent to the minister are you aware of the fact that the Act provides that that shall be done?—A. I report directly to my senior officer, Dr. Christie, and he makes a report to Ottawa, to his chief.

Mr. ARGUE: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, there has been a serious breach of the law as applied to contagious diseases. I am not a lawyer but that section is perfectly clear to me, that if any inspector finds infectious or contagious disease of animals, he shall with all practical speed send a copy thereof to the minister.

Mr. STEWART: In all fairness to the witness and departmental practice you are not going to condemn this witness because he did not send it direct to the minister. When he sends it through his senior officer to the head of the branch at Ottawa he has discharged his responsibility; he is not expected to send it to Ottawa to the minister direct, surely. You are blaming the witness for it.

Mr. ARGUE: Ultimately the minister, after weeks, nearly a month went by, before he finally got it.

I am not blaming this particular witness, Mr. Chairman, because we have heard evidence already and there was no report for weeks sent to the minister. We already have that on the record.

The WITNESS: We are not allowed to go over the head of our superior officer.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Those are the instructions you have?—A. Those are the instructions we have. If we go over the head of our superior officer, our district inspector, we would be rapped over the knuckles for it.

Q. And who was your superior officer?—A. Dr. Christie.

Q. That is my understanding, and through Dr. Christie it would go to?—A. It is our understanding that we have to report to the officer under whom we work.

Q. When was the quarantine applied to the government bulls in Regina?—A. January 31st.

Q. Was there any evidence of disease? Did you see any disease yourself, was any report made of any disease among those bulls before January 31st?—A. No, exception, for instance, early last fall we had foot rot among these 10 bulls.

Mr. STEWART: On that other point, does not the Act also contain a definition of the word "minister"?

Mr. ARGUE: I was looking for it but I didn't see it. It may be there, I did not see it.

Mr. STEWART: If you will give me the Act I will check it for you.

Mr. ARGUE: I did not see it in the Act.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Was there any vesicular disease among these bulls?—A. None at all.

Q. Did you see them from time to time during the month of January?—A. I did, yes. In the first place a short horn bull was brought in from one of the pastures. These government bulls are sent out to the P.F.R.A. pastures to be placed there and they are brought in from time to time and exchanged and sent back again. This bull was brought in because of foot rot. This bull was turned in to Regina last fall, in November; and, its feet were in very bad condition with foot rot, and this bull was allowed to run loose in the paddocks, that is how paddocks got infected. Other bulls also who were turned into this paddock became infected with foot rot and the foot rot went pretty well through them all. We treated them for foot rot and they recovered.

Q. Have you discovered how the infection got into those bulls?—A. We have not.

Q. There were no animals brought into that premise there from infected premises that you know of?—A. No. Artificial insemination was conducted there also in the case of these bulls, up until the time of the quarantine being put on; and, naturally, there were females brought there for breeding purposes.

Q. And you think perhaps that is where they were infected?—A. Well, I can't find any evidence of any herd having sent any animals there which were infected.

Q. Just one other question. Were government veterinarians going in and out of that establishment, veterinarians who had been on premises of infected herds?—A. No.

Q. You say yourself that you were in from time to time in January?—A. Occasionally animals were tested there, that is animals brought in from barn 9—they are put in barn 9 to be tested for T.B., and after they are tested, they go from there into barn 10 after the test is completed. The moment it

was known that I was working on this vesicular trouble we were having I was instructed not to test any more animals for tuberculosis under any consideration and to apply myself entirely to this branch of the work.—stomatitis.

Q. Am I right that you yourself and other veterinarians who inspected some of these infected herds, herds infected with stomatitis, did subsequently go into that establishment of bulls in Regina?—A. No, I was the only one who was dealing with the infected herds.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cardiff.

By Mr. Cardiff:

Q. I just want to ask one or two questions. At what time during the period of this disease did you become disturbed as to what type the disease was—you called it stomatitis, or whatever it was—when did you first think it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. I can tell you that. On January 25th I quarantined Mr. J. M. Moore's herd. He had 19 cattle suffering from this trouble. I returned again on February 11th. From time to time I heard from the owner of the herd that the herd was recovering, doing all right, no particular trouble. Then I happened to hear that some hogs had been sick. He had only 2 or 3 hogs at his place, and Dr. Carlson and I went out to this place and he told us his hogs were all right, that the hogs had been sick a few days, but they had recovered all right, everything was all right; also he had a couple of horses that had gone off their feed and had become very listless. We examined the horses, examined their mouths and found nothing wrong, they seemed to be back on their feed all right. Just at that moment a couple of pigs ran out across the yard and Dr. Carlson noticed that one of the pigs had separations in the hoofs; and, of course, we became disturbed about that. That was the first case where we can find anything wrong with pigs in that way.

Q. That was on February 11th, did you say?—A. Yes, February 11th.

Q. Are you sure that was the 11th?—A. That is the first one I saw.

Q. Then you became suspicious that they might have some more serious disease?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Charlton.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Dr. James, you say you did not see any hogs or any pigs infected until, what date?—A. What was that?

Q. What date was it that you saw the first infected pig, infected with stomatitis, supposedly?—A. The first pig with stomatitis—January 29th, C. A. Clarke.

Q. Was this herd you mentioned where you saw the pigs on two occasions?—A. This was a separate herd altogether.

Q. Separate from the one you noticed on February 11th?—A. Yes.

Q. And what was the condition you saw then; was that when you saw the lesions?—A. That pig did not show any lesions, there were no lesions at all.

Q. It was just sort of weak and showed signs of distress when it got up?—A. Yes, and it complained when it got up, on its feet; squealed when it walked around; but otherwise in good physical condition. The pig was treated by Dr. Hewitt, then it was discovered that they had some cows in the herd which apparently were affected.

Q. There were 5 cattle infected in that herd?—A. Yes.

Q. But just the one pig?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you say that those symptoms; inability to eat properly, in the pig, and apparently its limbs were also affected; would you say at that time that this animal was also infected?—A. Yes.

Q. And if you found it infected would that not make you a little curious?—A. If I saw any lesions on a pig I would be curious, we have so many cases of swine sickness in which you have pigs getting stiffened up and lame and with no lesions and nothing around the mouth or nose I did not become very worried about this pig; in fact, it was being treated by a private practitioner and I took it to be a pig that had got a little bit stiff, but it had no lesions which would indicate that the animal was in bad condition. I thought probably it might have the same infection that the cattle had, but I still didn't find any symptoms.

Q. Now, doctor, you were one of the individuals who did the animal inoculations were you not, up until February 17th; or was it up until the 17th?—A. I inoculated at the Waas, Woods and Haun places, and then I did the inoculations when Dr. Childs was there. On February 18th two young animals two cattle and two pigs were brought in from away out, from distant parts of the province, and in company with Dr. Childs, Dr. Christie and Dr. Johnston, the provincial vet, and Mr. J. H. Coles, our senior livestock man—

Q. That was on the 18th of February?—A. Yes.

Q. When was the first time you got a positive reaction; what was the first positive reaction you had from those animals?—A. About the 25th or 26th.

Q. The first reaction was the 25th or 26th?—A. Yes, but the only reaction we got from those was the one steer that reacted. The same material was injected intermuscularly into two cattle and two hogs and we only got the one steer to react.

Q. Just the one out of 4?—A. Yes. And then I was instructed to stay away from there. As I was dealing with other herds around and it might be carrying the infection and I didn't go back. We put on guards who watched the herd very carefully, but I did not go back, I did not see the report and I did not see the reactions; that was all done by other officers; but only one had a reaction.

Q. And that was one which had been inoculated on the 2nd of December and inspected on the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th, and then you skipped the 7th?—A. Yes.

Q. And again on the 8th; what positive reaction did you find on these horses?—A. On Saturday, December 8th I found vesicles on the horse's tongue.

Q. But you found nothing else whatsoever?—A. No.

Q. What was the age of these horses?—A. Pardon me?

Q. What was the age of these horses?—A. Oh, 6 and 8 years old.

Q. 6 and 8 years old?—A. Yes.

Q. Were they in the same barn with the infected cows?—A. They were in another section, in the stable.

Q. But in the same building?—A. Yes, in the horse stable, adjoining the dairy stable.

Q. And the infection, as we got the information, the horses had been on that farm since at least the 26th of November?—A. I cannot say how long any of the horses were there, the first time I saw them was on December 2.

Q. On December 2, and it was later found that the infection had been brought to the Burns' plant, was it not on the 26th—I believe that is the date, that that was the date they went into the Burns' plant? Now, having regard to that, do you not think it a good idea to inspect horses that are on the premises which could have been contacted by cattle which were infected?—A. I would

say this, that in getting horses to inject from the owners of the horses outside of these premises, some of them objected very strenuously, they would not allow the horses to be injected, in fact, did not want them to be injected. I would not actually object to such a request myself.

Q. They didn't want to sell the horse to you?—A. No, I didn't mention buying them.

Q. Outside the premises?—A. Outside the premises.

Q. Of course, that would be a very great help, would it not?—A. Well, the horses were not available to us for injection. It would be asking a lot of an owner to go into his premises and take horses that have not been infected and inject them.

Q. And you would not suggest that, would you?—A. I would not suggest that at all.

Q. I am not suggesting that you wanted to get horses from other premises, I am suggesting that you get horses from the same premises, the premises that are infected, and keep them there.—A. I do not think that would be good practice at all.

Q. Pardon me?—A. I would not like to take uninfected horses on to infected premises and infect them there by inoculation. I would think I would get a better reaction from bringing in horses from some farm that had not been infected, had not been in touch with an infected herd.

Q. Did you do that with some of the horses you injected?—A. I certainly did not, they belonged to the owner, right on the place.

Q. Yes, then you did not do what you thought it was best to do?—A. I was not going to ask the owner to give me horses. I had no authority to do so.

Q. Now, Dr. James, I am trying to get information, naturally, but who gave you the instructions as to where you were to inject the horses, what you were to do; and the instructions as to the injections?—A. Dr. Christie. I broached the subject to Dr. Christie. He said to test the horses, or to let Dr. Carlson do it, and we both agreed it would be a good idea, and I was detailed to do so.

Q. And you injected the horses?—A. Yes.

Q. So that you would have preferred to have been able to get young horses from premises away from those on which the infection was suspected?—A. Yes. Dr. Christie mentioned that at one time; but the unfortunate fact was that we just thought it was stomatitis and not so very important and that was not done.

Q. Could it be said then that you probably were biased in your views when you thought it was stomatitis and it was not necessary to take the usual precautions probably that would have been taken had you not been quite so sure it was stomatitis?—A. Nobody was sure.

Q. That is the point, Dr. James, nobody was sure; I am suggesting that you should have taken all the precautions you could possibly take in order to be sure. Now, it has been said here several times that a diagnosis could not be made without animal inoculation?—A. That is why I inoculated the horses.

Q. But you suggested yourself it would have been better to take horses from outside rather than horses that were on the premises to inoculate, did you not?—A. Yes.

Q. In the case of the horse on December 12, was that horse from the premises, that you inoculated on December 12?—A. Yes, that horse was on the premises. That horse was brought in from pasture on Mr. Woods' place and I inoculated him.

Q. Brought in from pasture?—A. Yes.

Q. Was he pasturing alone in the field?—A. No, with other horses.

Q. And with cattle at all?—A. No.

Q. And he had not had access to any cattle at all?—A. Not that I know of. He was in the pasture some distance away.

Q. That horse did not show any reaction at all?—A. Just a slight reddened patch where I scarified the tongue and inoculated him. I did not see any vesicles.

Q. Did the horse inoculated on February 12 on the Hahn property show any vesicles at all? That was the fourth horse, the third group that was inoculated.—A. Yes, those horses were inoculated twice, on the 12th and the 16th.

Q. The same horse was inoculated twice?—A. Yes, the same horse.

Q. You did not get any reaction from the inoculation on the 12th?—A. Very little reaction.

Q. And you inoculated the same horse again on the 16th?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. Get any reaction then?—A. I got slight reaction, one like an intradermal tuberculin reaction.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Do you think that would have given you any indication of a definite reaction?—A. If I had got a reaction I would have suspected stomatitis.

Q. After inoculating him on the 16th?—A. Yes, I would.

Q. Now, on December 28 in reporting on Mr. Leonard Waas' farm you say:

I also found that the two horses experimentally inoculated with material from the sore mouths of the infected cattle are now showing symptoms of stomatitis.

—A. That is right.

Q.

I am now satisfied that we are not dealing with a dangerous infectious disease and I recommend that the quarantine of the owner's livestock and premises be terminated.

—A. That is right.

Q. Now, Dr. James, in this other report of December 6 on the same herd, part of your report reads thus:

The two horses which I attempted to inoculate experimentally are not exhibiting any symptoms or lesions of the disease so far and appear quite healthy. I am now quite satisfied that we are not dealing with a dangerous infectious disease.

How do you account for those two statements?—A. Well, the fact that the cattle were recovering.

Q. They were injected on the 3rd, was it—the horses were injected on the 3rd?—A. Yes.

Q. And on the 6th you write that they appear healthy and then three days afterwards they appeared healthy and:

I am now quite satisfied—

You put "quite satisfied" there.

—that we are not dealing with a dangerous infectious disease.

Then, on the 6th you say, "We are not dealing with a dangerous infectious disease," after the way the horses have reacted?—A. In reference to the first statement there, the fact that the cattle were recovering and going back onto milk production gave me the idea of writing that report.

Q. But you scarified those horses' tongues yourself, did you?—A. Yes.

Q. With the diseased material from an infected cow?—A. Yes.

Q. You did it to the best of your ability?—A. Yes.

Q. And on the third day afterwards you found no reaction at all?—A. Yes.

Q. How long ordinarily would you think it would take for that material having been injected on the tongue of the horse to cause some symptoms?—A. Well, you might get reaction any time, I might say, from eighteen hours up to ten days.

Q. And if the material was a virulent type of material and taken from a vesicle, you would naturally expect to get some reaction before five days?—A. Yes, normally.

Q. Normally you would?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, having had no reaction I cannot still understand on the third day when there is no reaction in the animal, in the horse, you are now quite satisfied you are not dealing with a dangerous infection. Would that not be evidence to prove that you were dealing with a dangerous disease?—A. My reason for saying that was that the animals in the herd were all recovering without any further trouble. I was satisfied we did not have a dangerous disease, not particularly because the horse did not show reaction but simply because the whole picture seemed to be of recovery and improvement. I was satisfied we were getting somewhere.

Q. Now, again on January 2, remembering the fact that there were only two horses, you injected the first two—you injected two with no reaction, even the young horse of February 17 did not give a positive reaction, and here on January 2 on the farm of R. Clifton you enter in your report:

Major disease infectious stomatitis.

And then you go on:

I visited the above premises and inspected two horses and two cattle and found that up to the present time the horses have not become infected although they are stabled in stalls adjoining stalls occupied by the two cows which were exhibiting very severe symptoms of stomatitis.

Now, how do you account for that statement, Dr. James?—A. Well, they did not become infected.

Q. They just did not become infected?—A. No.

Q. They were standing right beside the two cows?—A. Those two cows recovered and went back to normal.

Q. They recovered?—A. They both recovered.

Q. That is possible, is it not, with foot and mouth disease?—A. Well, I never thought that animals would recover. I thought we would get a long period of emaciation, ulcerated feet, sore mouths, that would pull animals down. These animals did not lose weight, they went right on as if nothing had happened.

Q. What is the average of type A virus with animals with foot and mouth disease?—A. Five per cent.

Q. You would not expect the cattle to be off too long, would you?—A. Well, there are different virulences in type A. On type A one set of virus is not as virulent as another of the same type.

Q. But did you not have in your mind a much more serious disease than was probably evident in this stomatitis outbreak? You thought foot and mouth was much too serious and you thought it was not so serious?—A. I was quite satisfied with all these recoveries taking place that we did not have foot and mouth disease. I was not much alarmed until I saw the hogs developing vesicles in their feet and then I was alarmed, but not before that.

The CHAIRMAN: I think your time is about up, Mr. Charlton.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. Dr. James, as a layman I thought it rather confusing that this disease of foot and mouth is not supposed to be a disease that can be taken by horses. Now, I find that, for instance, on December 1 you inoculated two horses as a field test and the two horses developed the symptoms of the disease?—A. One developed very marked symptoms, the other very, very slight.

Q. I find that even on January 25, at the very end of January on the Moore farm, the owner reported that two horses had become very listless and off their feed for some days but were then apparently recovering. In your opinion is that more or less the same thing that happened on the Waas farm?—A. Of course, the Moore horses were not injected. Those horses just became sick themselves and Dr. Carlson and I examined those horses and found they were perfectly normal. The owner reported that two or three days before they had gone through the same symptoms as the cattle—stood around listlessly and would not eat. They then came back on their feed again.

Q. I am going to ask your opinion but you do not have to answer if you do not wish. In your opinion is it possible that some of those cases were really cases of vesicular stomatitis?—A. Quite so; I firmly believe they were.

Q. It is quite possible that some of those cases were vesicular stomatitis?—A. I cannot see how you can take herd after herd of cattle with foot and mouth disease and treat them and have them recover and come right back into full milk supply and take on flesh and get well so quickly afterwards as these cattle did.

Q. Then, if the horse is inoculated—let us take December 3, you have two horses which are inoculated. If they develop the symptoms, then it has to be vesicular stomatitis or are there exceptions to the rule that horses do not react to foot and mouth disease?—A. Horses never react to foot and mouth disease.

Q. Then, if they developed the symptoms, it would indicate that possibly some of those animals developed vesicular stomatitis—that is your opinion?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Dr. James, I really appreciate the straightforward answers you are giving to the questions that have been asked of you and I think you have been very, very honest in your opinions. I would just like to ask you two or three questions. Do you know how many private veterinarians were called in to diagnose this outbreak in and around Regina?—A. In the first case Dr. Hunter was the first man called in, the Waas case. He was not called in on any further cases. All other cases were reported to me. Dr. Hewitt and his assistant Dr. Dosch reported two or three places where they had been in and I went out to examine them and put them under quarantine. Dr. Waecher who was formerly provincial veterinarian went to one or two premises and found this condition there but through some misunderstanding he did not report to our department. We did not find out until a little bit later on. They were the only veterinarians that I know of who reported any cases to us at all.

Q. And he diagnosed these cases as stomatitis?—A. Yes. In fact, I went on to one or two places which he reported, the Barry's, Jones' and Clarke's. I went with Dr. Dosch—Dr. Hewitt was sick in hospital. I accompanied Dr. Dosch, his assistant, there and we agreed that it was stomatitis, the same as we had in other places. In fact, he prescribed for these cattle himself—Mr. Clements' and Mr. Barry's and one or two others.

Q. Would you be in a position to say how many years this gentleman you refer to has practised?—A. Pardon?

Q. Would you be in a position to say how many years this gentleman you refer to as a private veterinarian has practised?—A. Dr. Hewitt has been in practice for a great many years in Regina, and Dr. Dosch is his assistant and is a graduate of a college in Russia. He is not a D.P. but he is a man who emigrated to this country, brought his family with him and got appointed assistant to Dr. Hewitt and he had seen a great deal of foot and mouth in all parts of Europe.

Q. In other words, in your opinion Dr. Hewitt is regarded as a very good veterinarian?—A. Well, yes he is. He has been regarded as a fairly good practitioner.

Q. Do you know a Dr. Johnson?—A. I do.

Q. A provincial man?—A. Yes.

Q. During this time did Dr. Johnson ever talk to you about this outbreak?—A. Yes, he did.

Q. And during this time did you have Dr. Johnson's co-operation at all times?—A. Yes, Dr. Johnson always co-operated with us.

Q. And I gather from the information you have given that the provincial government veterinarians and the dominion men were working in co-operation to diagnose these cases?—A. Dr. Johnson was a frequent visitor to our head office in Regina and as far as I know personally he always co-operated with me and with Dr. Christie and with Dr. Carlson and I do not know any case where he did not co-operate.

Q. And would you know how long Dr. Johnson has practised?—A. Dr. Johnson graduated about a year ago.

Q. He graduated a year ago?—A. Yes, and became assistant provincial veterinarian and then he was promoted when Dr. Waechter retired from the position and Dr. Johnson took his position as provincial veterinarian.

Q. Then he was appointed two years ago?—A. A year ago—within the last year.

Q. Dr. James, I saw the report as of December 28 and I was wondering have you ever been asked to forward samples of stomatitis to Ottawa?—A. Have I ever been asked to forward samples?

Q. Yes, to forward samples of the virus?—A. By whom?

Q. By anyone.—A. No, as Dr. Carlson has said, we were not supposed to forward samples of any vesicular materials.

Q. In other words, you do not do these things unless you receive instructions from headquarters?—A. It has been a long-standing understanding in our department that we were not to forward samples.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. And that understanding was there for some time?—A. Since I can remember.

Q. And you were in the department, doctor, when?—A. Since 1929.

By Mr. Anderson:

Q. Dr. James, I believe you indicated to us and some of the other witnesses did too, that the animals in the Waas herd and some of the other herds showed signs of recovery, the early herds?—A. Yes, they all recovered rapidly.

Q. Were those animals killed?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it your opinion that these animals would have completely recovered had they been allowed to live?—A. Well, they were still living when they were slaughtered.

Q. Well, can one cure foot and mouth disease if one could isolate herds and take chances?—A. Well, that has been tried in different countries with absolute failure. Of course, there is the possibility of mixed virus. These animals may have been infected with foot and mouth disease and stomatitis which is quite possible, and the animals recover, but later on from what our history shows or as near as we can gather, the Waas' cattle infected Burns' stockyard and foot and mouth disease was found in Burns' stockyard. Therefore, Waas' cattle must have had foot and mouth disease. That is the general conclusion, but foot and mouth disease and vesicular stomatitis is so very identical that it requires experts and there are very, very few experts today who can differentiate between them.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. The member for Springfield made a remark concerning Dr. Hewitt, a veterinarian?—A. Yes.

Q. He was in private practice?—A. Yes.

Q. And he investigated a lot of these cases about three weeks before the real trouble started privately or some of them?—A. I cannot tell you that. I have no record of Dr. Hewitt investigating any of those diseases until after the Waas' outbreak.

Q. Was he ever in the employ of the provincial government?—A. No.

Q. Just a private practitioner?—A. Yes, a private practitioner.

Q. And then Dr. Johnson, the provincial veterinarian, also went out with you on occasion?—A. Yes, Dr. Johnson did on one or two occasions and he went out with some of our inspectors to different places.

Q. And I suppose from time to time you interviewed the provincial minister, Mr. Nollett?—A. I did not, but my superior officers may have had conferences with the Minister of Agriculture.

Q. You were there on occasions?—A. No, I was not there.

Q. You know the deputy minister, Mr. Horner? Were you there when they saw him?—A. No, my superior officers had conferences, Dr. Childs and Dr. Christie had conferences with the provincial people but I was not present.

Q. You were not present?—A. No, but at least I understand they had conferences.

Q. And Dr. Johnson did go out on some of these cases, to your knowledge?—A. Yes, Dr. Johnson was present when we inoculated on a couple of occasions.

Q. And he never at any time demanded or requested that you send a sample to Ottawa?—A. No, he was quite satisfied that we were dealing with stomatitis.

Q. At all times while he was with you this provincial veterinarian was quite satisfied with the course you were taking?—A. Absolutely.

Q. There were no disputes between you? He did not say, "Here, you are not doing enough on this thing"?—A. No, never.

Q. In the provincial government's employ they have in addition to the veterinarians that have been mentioned, they co-operate with the municipalities under the Act?—A. Yes.

Q. And according to their own records they had about twenty employees with the municipalities—veterinarians?—A. Yes, in districts.

Q. Including these districts that were affected?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. There was a communication between Dr. Childs and the office in Regina on December 2, a telephone communication, either on the 1st or 2nd, was there not, after you had reported this outbreak to Dr. Childs?—A. I understand that my superior officer did phone Dr. Childs.

Q. You have no knowledge yourself as to what instructions were given by Dr. Childs at that time?—A. The only instructions I got were in his report, that he instructed me to quarantine the premises and hold everything tight. It reads:

Advised veterinary director general by phone requesting further instructions; instructed to quarantine premises and keep premises and neighbours' premises under observation.

Q. There were no instructions from Dr. Childs over the phone with respect to inoculating horses on the Waas farm?—A. Well, I was not present at the time the phone message was put through. I did not know exactly what was said. Those were my instructions.

Q. If there were no instructions from Dr. Childs with respect to the inoculation of horses on the Waas farm, who reached that decision?—A. Dr. Christie, Dr. Carlson and myself.

Q. You discussed the matter?—A. We discussed the matter.

Q. During that discussion was there any suggestion that it might be a more dangerous disease than vesicular stomatitis?—A. No, we were quite satisfied with what we had. We thought that we had stomatitis.

Q. There was no discussion at all with respect to it being a more dangerous disease?—A. No, not at that time.

Q. I do not think that corresponds with Dr. Carlson's evidence. That does not matter, we can see that later. How do you inoculate these horses?—A. Well, in the first place I take a scalpel, boil it, sterilize it, and also take a new ordinary stiff nail brush and boil that thoroughly and sterilize it. I then wash the horse's mouth out with a sterile solution and taking the sterilized scalpel I scrape the tongue in this manner, like you would scrape the skin off a carrot or vegetables. I scrape the tongue until I get blood. I then take the sterilized brush and brush material off the cow's tongue, a good active case that I found there, brush the epithelium or slobbering off the cow's mouth and brush it vigorously into this tongue of the horse and also scarify the jaws of the horse. On both occasions I did the same thing. That is just a field test. It is not a very scientific test but it is the best you can do in the field.

Q. When the inoculation and reading took place on the 8th—on the 6th there was no reaction—but on the 8th there was, according to reports. Did anyone else but yourself see this reaction?—A. The owner, Mr. Waas.

Q. There was no other veterinarian that examined it?—A. No, I was doing this work alone. I was detailed to do all this work alone by myself.

Q. When you suggested to Mr. Waas that you inoculate his horses with the virus that his cows were suffering from, did he object?—A. Not at all.

Q. He did not ask for any explanation as to why you would transfer the disease from his cows to his horses?—A. I told him that I would want to be satisfied with the type of virus we had and he was quite co-operative. In fact, he was one of the most co-operative men we had. He said, "Certainly, go ahead and inject them if you like."

Q. What would the inoculation of the horses decide? You say you were anxious to find out the type of virus?—A. If the horse developed vesicles on its tongue I would say the horse had stomatitis the same as the infected cattle had.

Q. It would not indicate anything more dangerous, that was not the reason why you inoculated the horses—to determine whether there was anything more dangerous than stomatitis? It was simply to determine whether there was stomatitis or not?—A. It is a quite common thing.

Q. In other words, there was no discussion between yourself and Dr. Carlson and Dr. Christie as to the possibility of this being anything dangerous? This was the first field test that would be made?—A. No, the idea was we agreed that to satisfy ourselves we would inoculate horses.

Q. To satisfy yourselves—A. That they had stomatitis. We could prove stomatitis by producing a reaction in the horses.

Q. This is a disease, this vesicular stomatitis, that horses are subject to?—A. They are subject to it.

Q. And there were no horses developed this disease in any of the horses that were inspected and reported to have vesicular stomatitis?—A. Well, right here I might say that horses have become very scarce on the farms in Saskatchewan and we had lots of places where there were no horses at all or one or two horses that were being used running out in the pasture somewhere and we did not expect to find many horses. Had there been a considerable quantity of horses right next to them we would have inspected them, to find out from the horses.

Q. But there were horses on several of the farms?—A. Yes, there were.

Q. According to these reports there were horses stabled right alongside two cattle which had the disease rather severely?—A. Yes.

Q. But still you were not suspicious of anything as a result of that?—A. No, had those cattle exhibited the symptoms of foot and mouth disease I would have been suspicious.

Mr. WRIGHT: It being six o'clock, will I suspend?

Mr. STEWART: Are there any more questions to be asked of Dr. James?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Quelch had a question.

Mr. BRYCE: Do you mean to sit this evening at eight o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think so.

Mr. CHARLTON: Have Dr. James and Dr. Carlson both plane reservations back tonight?

Mr. STEWART: I think we could finish with him in a quarter of an hour.

Mr. LAING: Is it planned to hold a meeting tonight?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think so.

Mr. ARGUE: The question is, is Dr. James taking the plane west tonight if we are finished with him?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. STEWART: We do not want to sit tonight at 8 o'clock. I thought if members could shorten it we could sit here for half an hour longer and finish with him.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to see him finished and allowed to get away if he has a plane reservation.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Dr. James, do you consider there is a probability that actually there was an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan at the same time as the stomatitis?—A. That is my firm opinion.

Q. And that is the reason the two horses reacted?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Is it your opinion that there was foot and mouth disease in the Waas herd?—A. There might have been. After I released them from quarantine I never went back to Waas'. I never saw the last phase of this at all. That was handled by other inspectors.

Q. In view of the spread of the disease around the country from Waas' place to other places, is it not your professional opinion there was foot and mouth disease in the Waas herd?—A. If it is true that Burns' stockyard became infected from the cattle they bought from Waas, it is quite possible they did, but as far as I was concerned, after my experience with stomatitis, I did not see anything that would cause me to say they had foot and mouth.

Q. No, not at that time, but today in view of the spread of the disease around the country. I do not want to go all over this report I have here, but you have it, and it sets out step by step the possible source of infection, and I think you can trace it right from the Waas herd, and I asked if, in your opinion, is it likely there was foot and mouth disease in the Waas herd?—A. It is quite possible.

Q. I see—it is quite possible. If it were not, then what information we have here as to the possible source of infection would not mean anything.

A. It is quite possible there was.

The CHAIRMAN: For the information of the committee, I understand these gentlemen have their tickets for tonight's plane. It is guaranteed that they will get away tonight, if they can get released by the committee.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. You said previously to me, Dr. James, that it was never your understanding that when you found an infectious disease you had to send a copy of your report directly to the minister?—A. As I said before, we are not allowed to communicate directly with the minister. It was never the custom to do so. Any communication goes through our superior officer to the minister.

Q. Is that a written order you have from your superior officer or is it just an understanding?—A. It is an understanding.

Q. Not a written order?

Mr. LAING: It would be common sense, too.

Mr. ARGUE: Never mind—it is not in accord with the Act. I do not need interruptions from my honourable friend.

The WITNESS: We had a circular to the effect at one time that we must not communicate with the minister on personal or trivial affairs, because he was engaged in much more weighty problems than our personal affairs.

Mr. ARGUE: Of course this would not be a trivial affair, hardly, as it has worked out.

The WITNESS: No, but it is our custom to send all correspondence to the minister through our superior officer.

Mr. STEWART: And it has been the practice for 20 years.

Mr. ARGUE: I would like, if I can, to be given a copy of the order that is used to quarantine an infected premises, if that can be made available, and could you also supply me with a copy of the order lifting the quarantine?

Mr. JUTRAS: It is on file. I tried to look at it myself, but probably the difficulty is that on the mimeographed copy they have only printed the one page. They did not print the back page of the order.

Mr. ARGUE: Particularly, I would like to have sent to me now, if I may, a copy of the order lifting the quarantine. Could you send it over now? Can you find one and hand it to me?

Mr. JUTRAS: You have the other one.

Mr. ARGUE: If you will give me the page I can find it myself.

Mr. WRIGHT: On page 20, there is one here.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Lifting the quarantine? Form 59, page 20, of the mimeographed instructions in the large file we have, there is a form for the removal of a quarantine of the infected place known as Northwest 22/18/15 W. 2nd. Qu Apelle, Saskatchewan, the farm of Mr. L. Woods. When you issue an order like that, Dr. James, lifting a quarantine, do you do it on your own authority solely, or do you comply with instructions from your superior official?—A. Instructions from a higher official. I report the condition of the herd, or whatever I may be dealing with, and if the condition seems satisfactory and there is no further danger of infection, my superior officer then instructs me to recommend termination of the quarantine.

Q. And your instructions lifting the quarantine come only from your superior officer?—A. Yes.

Q. Despite the fact that subsection 3 of section 25 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act reads as follows—and this is after the minister has received a report of an infectious disease: "If it appears that such disease did not exist, the minister may so determine and declare, and thereupon the place, comprised in the inspector's declaration, or affected thereby, shall cease to be deemed an infected place."

(2) above says: "If it appears that infectious or contagious disease exists, the minister may so determine and declare, and may prescribe the limits of the infected place."

It seems to me—

Mr. STEWART: Now now—

Mr. ARGUE: When the premises were quarantined first and an infectious disease established, the minister should have been sent in compliance with the Act a copy of that report; and then again, according to the Act—and once more I am only a layman—but the Act provides when the quarantine is lifted it shall be by order of the minister; and when the specific area in which the quarantine is established it shall be on order of the minister?

Mr. DECORE: Not "shall" but "may"?

Mr. ARGUE: I have heard lawyers argue one way and another before.

Mr. LAING: What is the definition of "minister"?

Mr. ARGUE: The Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. DECORE: What is the definition of "may" and "shall"?

Mr. ARGUE: "May" and "shall"—we have heard many times in government legislation "may" is mandatory?

Mr. LAING: Surely the minister means the chain of command?

Mr. JUTRAS: Could we not argue the point at another time?

By Mr. Argue:

Q. According to subsection 2(e) "minister" means the Minister of Agriculture. That is what the Act says. The question I want to ask is this: In any of the general practices of your department in establishing a quarantine or lifting a quarantine, it is not the practice to have it by ministerial order?—A. Ministerial order covers the whole thing.

Q. But the order is not issued by the Minister of Agriculture?—A. It covers the general quarantine but not the individual quarantine.

Q. In this case the Minister of Agriculture had no knowledge of the lifting of the quarantine?—A. He certainly did. When this form 52 goes in I say in the form ". . . and find the cleansing and disinfection orders have been satisfactorily carried out and being satisfied that contagious disease does not exist in the animals on said premises I hereby recommend that the quarantine be terminated."

This form is forwarded with my report to Ottawa of my visit to that place. The minister exercises his authority through the veterinary director general and issues a release which is mailed to the owner.

Q. Did you not say to me you did not send a copy of your report to the minister?

Mr. STEWART: Direct?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Argue, I think perhaps Dr. Hall can speak on that form.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I do not intend to be passed off from one witness to another and, when you speak of Ottawa you are not speaking of having sent or having received communication from the Minister of Agriculture—you refer to sending a report in to the veterinary director general or his office?—A. I send my report to my head office in Regina and my superior in turn sends that report with all attached documents to the veterinary director general. The veterinary director general under authority of the minister issues an order to terminate the quarantine.

Q. Have you a copy of that order under the authority of the veterinary director general lifting the quarantine?—A. We do not get that. That is sent directly to the owner from the veterinary director general.

Q. I wonder if I might be supplied with a copy of that order?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: You said a while ago, Dr. James, that you first were alarmed that this outbreak might be foot and mouth disease when you saw a pig in company with Dr. Carlson with a separated hoof?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think my meaning is clear.

The WITNESS: I do not think Dr. Carlson would quite agree with that.

Mr. BRYCE: You better clarify the statement.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. That was on February 12th. You and Dr. Carlson saw a pig with a separated hoof. From that time on you were very suspicious or alarmed that it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. We reported immediately to our superior officer.

Q. And you reported that you were alarmed that it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you never suspicious before that that this might be foot and mouth disease?—A. No, because it never got into hogs. The hog is the most susceptible animal to this disease and we were finding hogs—for instance at the Waas place, feeding with the cattle, drinking out of the cattle trough, and we did not get alarmed.

Q. If you were not suspicious why did you inject these horses on December 3rd?—A. To satisfy myself as to the type of virus we had.

Q. Is it true that the only thing an injection of the horses will do is to satisfy you that it is stomatitis or foot and mouth disease?—A. I was not bothered about foot and mouth disease, I wanted to satisfy myself that we had stomatitis.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. I was satisfied when we did get a reaction from the horses that we had stomatitis. Had I been alarmed about foot and mouth disease at that time nothing like this would ever have happened.

Q. The thing you wanted to establish by injecting these horses was that it was stomatitis but, if it were not stomatitis it must have been in your mind that it was foot and mouth disease?—A. No, it was not.

Q. Why inject the horses at all if you were certain it was stomatitis?—A. Well, when you are sending an official document down to the head of government you do not want to play around with it. You want to have something to show you know what you are doing—to back up your judgment. To back up my judgment I inoculated the horses with the advice and instructions of my superior officers—not to satisfy myself about foot and mouth disease. During the time before we got the reaction from the horses the herd was all recovered from the disease and I was quite happy.

Q. You injected four horses and of the four horses you injected did any of them actually develop vesicles as a result of those injections?—A. The first two horses, yes.

Q. I thought you said awhile ago that they gave a very slight reaction or redness of the tongue?—A. That is the other horse.

Mr. JUTRAS: You have 'the wrong horse'.

The WITNESS: Here is a diagram of the vesicles we got on the first horse. That represents the tongue.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. So two of these horses developed vesicles?—A. One horse developed vesicles. The second horse had a very slight reaction—nothing to go by at all.

Q. It did not develop vesicles?—A. It developed very slightly—but I would not say it was a good reaction at all.

Q. And the third and fourth horses did not develop anything?—A. No, nor the fifth horse.

Q. When you found the horses, except for the first one, did not develop vesicles what was your reaction to that?—A. Well, everything was progressing so nicely and all these recoveries took place everybody was quite happy about it. I was not worrying about whether the horses took it. I got past that stage.

Q. In other words, the evidence of the injection of the horses you would say you rejected or disregarded?—A. Well, I could have injected lots of horses in this campaign had the owners been in favour of doing so but several owners would not let me inject their horses.

Q. The point is that you did inject 4 sets of horses; you actually did inject horses at four different times?—A. Yes.

Q. And of those four different times, only on one occasion did vesicles develop?—A. In the case of Haun's I did get a reaction, but not the right vesicular reaction you should get in stomatitis. I got a reaction, but Dr. Shahan, the authority from Washington, as well as a large number of our own departmental veterinarians who came with me, such as Dr. Saint, Dr. Willick, and Dr. Leclair and who saw those horses, and they were interested at that time in whether I had a sufficient reaction to call it stomatitis. Dr. Shahan said: No, you have not got a good stomatitis reaction there. So I took his judgment on the matter because he is an outstanding authority on the subject from Washington.

Q. As I said a moment ago, what does all—

The CHAIRMAN: Please let the witness answer. He is looking it up.

Mr. JUTRAS: What is the date? He did not arrive until the 18th, so it must have been the 19th?

The WITNESS: February 21, and 22.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. Yes. I remembered more or less what the date was, but I am not particularly interested in that. What I am interested in is what I stated a few minutes ago, that the evidence that you got, as far as these horses were concerned, was more or less disregarded because of the fact that the cattle in those various infected herds had recovered.—A. Quite so, and also the fact that these horses may have become immune to vesicular stomatitis, due to antibodies in the horses' systems. It is not always possible to get a reaction when you have a positive disease.

Q. Well I will leave the matter of these horses at that point, although it seems to me that there is not much use injecting them unless you are going to take the evidence you get as a result and accept it. But apparently in this case it was not accepted. When this general quarantine was put on, on February 18, I believe it was, what measures were taken to keep that quarantine in force, and particularly what measures were taken to prevent the farmers, whose horses were infected, from visiting other towns, visiting their neighbouring towns, and so forth?—A. That was done by my superior officers, and I did not have any hand in it at all.

Q. You took no part in the quarantine procedures?—A. The general quarantine after the foot and mouth disease was confirmed, you mean?

Q. The general quarantine which was put on on February 18?—A. Yes, and that was done by my superior officers, not by myself.

Q. You took no part in the enforcement of that quarantine?—A. Yes. I circulated among the different premises all around Regina and I warned the owners of infected premises to stay at home and not to spread the disease; in addition, I warned others to stay away from the infected premises; and we also had the R.C.M.P. detailed to see that premises were properly quarantined, and that nobody entered or left those premises. Everything was done that was possible.

Q. How was that done by the R.C.M.P.?—A. I have not got authority to say how it was done. They acted on instructions from higher-ups.

Q. Did you actually see any of this being done by the R.C.M.P.?—A. I saw them tacking up cards on premises that were quarantined.

Q. And would they do anything in addition to that?—A. They would see the owner of the premises and they would tell him to keep his people on that premises, and to keep his animals at home.

Q. And then they would move on to the next farm?—A. They would just go to the gate and nail up the quarantine card.

Q. And after they had done that, after putting up the cards, they would move on to the next farm, after giving instructions to the farmer?—A. They carried out their program.

Q. But in fact you do not know how this quarantine was maintained?—A. I would say very well.

Q. But you do not know the exact means by which it was maintained?—A. Yes. I told you that the owners were warned.

Q. You told me that it was not part of your work, and that you did not know.—A. I mean, I did not have any authority to issue that general quarantine. That was done by the veterinary director-general through our office, through Dr. Wells, and the people in charge of the program. But I saw the quarantine in operation on different premises.

Q. What was there to prevent any particular farmer whose herd was quarantined from leaving his farm and going into town?

Mr. JUTRAS: This is a very important point, Mr. Chairman, but I think it has already been agreed previously that the man to answer such questions is Dr. Wells, and that he would give us that information.

Mr. HARKNESS: Well, if that is the case, I am perfectly satisfied, because I do not think that this witness is probably qualified to answer this type of question. He has said that he himself was not concerned in the maintenance of that quarantine and that it was not part of his work. Therefore he is probably not qualified to answer the questions which I have in mind, so I shall leave them for another meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Bryce.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. I asked one previous witness about these sick herds at the Burns Co.—A. Yes.

Q. And the previous witness assured me that there was just a fence between the feed lots and the stockyards.—A. That is correct. But I would describe it this way: the packing plant is here; and next to the packing plant is a long lane, which ends up in a covered-in building, and running all the way back down to the east end, where all the cattle pens are; there is the feed lot.

Q. Could the cattle from one feed lot enter another, or rub noses? I put it that way; they could not touch another, could they?—A. No. There are the scales. They are in here, and the pens; and then there is a big wide laneway.

Q. Just so long as they could not touch one another, I am satisfied with that. Now, as to these animals that could be diseased; among the Waas

animals it was established that there were 32 sick in the yards?—A. 30 animals were sick in the yard the first day. I visited them and I found 30; and on the next day I found 60; and on the next day I found 100; and so on.

Q. Did any of those animals ever come into contact with diseased animals which were slaughtered and went through into the plant?—A. You mean animals from the feed lot?

Q. From the feed lot, or from the yard lot; did any of them come into contact with animals which were found to be suffering, or sick, either from one disease or the other?—A. No. The animals in the feed lot were all held under a tight quarantine. But animals were coming in every day by truck and being unloaded at this point here, and they would be brought in here and led down this lane directly to the packing plant for slaughter; and the men who drove those cattle or who looked after the feed lots were not allowed to mingle. They were not allowed to mingle with the men who drove the cattle in. They were kept away as much as possible.

Q. And could you vouch that no animals were slaughtered or went into the plant that could possibly have had infection?—A. Well, it is pretty hard to answer that.

Q. It is quite possible that some animal could have gone out that had a disease in it, such as the bones that caused the last outbreak or that was suspected of causing the last outbreak?—A. Well, I am not in a position to answer that. I know that my custom was to examine the stock for slaughter each evening, for slaughter on the following morning, anti-mortem inspection, and those animals were brought in by truck; they were not off the feed lot at all. They did not feed them over night like starving a turkey, and I examined those animals each evening to make sure that none went up on the killing floor. Dr. Gilson and Dr. Dryden, inspectors in charge of the plant, examined these animals in a post-mortem examination.

Q. I am just a layman and I might not use the correct terms, but the virus that caused this foot and mouth disease, could the animal have a living virus that a veterinary surgeon could not detect?—A. Absolutely.

Q. So it is quite possible some of these animals might have been suffering and it was not possible to find that out?—A. The period of incubation varies from hours to days. An animal could carry the virus on it for two days before it would show up and then suddenly break out, but any diseased animal from the feed lot was not allowed to be taken up and slaughtered before leaving quarantine.

Q. Well, I have that cleared up in my mind. Just one question. Was any suggestion ever made to you by any person or a brother in your own profession or anyone else that there should be other tests made—draw your attention to it and ask that you should go into this more thoroughly than you were doing?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. You are quite sure?—A. I cannot remember anybody suggesting that. I think that everybody was satisfied that things were going along all right until we got the break.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. This expert that was up from the United States on the 21st or 22nd of February, I believe you said, doctor, that the cases he examined were not even severe stomatitis?—A. Speaking about the horses he looked at?

Q. Yes, the tests he made or examinations he made. What do you say about him?—A. Well, Dr. Shahan when he came up there I took him out with me and several inspectors had him out with them. He came around to different premises. In the first premises of Hahn's practically all the cattle were recovered and healed up, and he was not alarmed about them, and he examined these

horses I had inoculated and in his opinion I did not get a good reaction, I did not get a good stomatitis reaction in these horses. We went on to other premises, to Delarue's, and he was satisfied then that we had foot and mouth disease. The hogs had it there.

Q. Now, much has been made by Mr. Argue, who likes to argue matters—you have been in the department a long time, you say, twenty years or so?—A. Yes.

Q. You have been under different ministers?—A. Yes.

Q. And the practice in the department has always been a chain of responsibility as we call it in the army?—A. Yes.

Q. You sent the report in to your immediate superior?—A. Right.

Q. Who in turn sends it on and it goes to the minister, all of it?—A. Yes.

Q. And that has always been the practice with half a dozen ministers you have served under?—A. Yes.

Q. And is a compliance with the Act, as a matter of fact?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Cardiff:

Q. Then, following that up, sending in these reports to your superior officers would you be able to tell how long it takes from the time it leaves you until it comes to Ottawa or would you have any idea?—A. The report is sent to the office, I take it, in the morning. It is booked up, checked over, read by my superior officer and if there are no corrections or anything like that the report is sent on that same evening by mail to Ottawa to the veterinary director general. Sometimes we consolidate the report, that is, if we are visiting the premises two or three times we will say, "Visited the premises 2nd, 3rd and 5th," and make four or five visits on one report.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. You just said unless there is anything wrong with the report. What could be wrong with the report that your superior officer would want to change in any way?—A. Well, if it was not quite plain, if I did not explain myself thoroughly he might say, "Well, here you make a statement here. Just what do you mean by that? I think you had better add on some words to make it more intelligible."

Q. He would talk to you?—A. Yes, my superior officer checks the reports and if he finds any omissions or anything in the report or any mistake he takes our reports and sends them back for correction or sees that it is made out in the proper form.

Q. He certainly would not do it without your O. K., would he?—A. The superior officer does not correct our reports; they are sent back to us and we have to correct them personally ourselves.

Q. Was the report you made on the J. C. Smith farm on December 14 sent back to you or the one you made on the Leonard Woods farm, the same date, wherein you used the word "aphtha"?—A. No.

Q. What did you refer to when you used that word?—A. Well, a sore mouth.

Q. Then you ordinarily use the word "aphthous" for a sore mouth?—A. Well, we have aphthous conditions in animals and human beings.

Q. Isn't "aphthous" used for another term?—A. Yes, sometimes it is.

Q. Was that not discussed when this report went through?—A. No.

Q. Was not mentioned at all?—A. Not that I can remember.

Q. Ordinarily you would use the word "aphthous" when you were trying to say there was foot and mouth disease and did not want to use the foot and mouth term?—A. If I had contagious aphthous I would have foot and mouth disease.

Q. Is not the foot and mouth known as apthous fever?—A. It is, yes.

Q. Did you have any intention of inferring that when you used the word "apthous"?—A. No.

Q. But you did not use it before and did not use it afterwards. What reason would you have for using it on those two occasions?—A. These cases of sloughing on the tongues of those cattle in those two places was very much more marked than it was in other places—larger areas of erosion on the tongues or apthous condition on those two horses. On the one occasion a piece of skin had come off the tongue as large as your hand or as large as a silver dollar. In other cases you would only have a very few small vesicles.

Q. That is the only reason you used those terms?—A. Yes.

Q. That was two days after you checked the horses?—A. Yes.

Q. Was there anyone with you at any time when you ever injected the horses?—A. Only the owner and his son.

Q. That was at Mr. Woods until the one that was injected on the 17th of February and then you say Dr. Shahan inspected the one injected on the 12th, but agreed with you that there was no positive reaction at all?—A. Yes.

Mr. JUTRAS: Just for your information there is a report here dated December 14 in which Dr. James uses the word "apthous" in connection with a horse.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is the one I have reference to. What number is that on the file?

Mr. JUTRAS: December 14, 1951—

The horse which was experimentally inoculated with material from the mouth of a diseased cow. : .

Mr. CHARLTON: What number?

Mr. JUTRAS: I am sorry, there is no number on it.

Mr. CHARLTON: What is the name of the farm?

Mr. JUTRAS: Leonard Woods of Qu'Appelle, about the third sentence, and it says:

The horse which was experimentally inoculated with material from the mouth of a diseased cow has so far shown no lesion or apthous or stomatitis.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is the one I just referred to.

Mr. JUTRAS: This is referring to a horse. My point is a horse cannot have foot and mouth disease so he used the word "apthous" in connection with a horse.

Mr. CHARLTON: That is why I am trying to find out why the word "apthous" was used.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. No one was with you, Dr. James, when you either made the inoculations or read the inoculations? That was left entirely to you?—A. Yes.

Q. It was left entirely with you when you made the inoculations and when you read them from the various horses?—A. Yes.

Q. You did say that it was your opinion that probably the Waas herd did have vesicular stomatitis and foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. That is your opinion, that both diseases were there?—A. I formed the belief that it was a mixed virus in that case.

Q. Did you make the inoculations on the Waas herd before they were killed?—A. I did not.

Q. Who did?—A. Some other inspector, Dr. Carlson can tell you about that.

Q. I have been trying to get that report and I have not been able to get it yet. I thought it was you, Dr. James, who had done all the rest of the inoculations on these animals?—A. No, I did not.

Q. You had nothing to do with it?—A. No.

Q. You do not know anything about it at all?—A. I do not know anything about it at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment; before we adjourn, gentlemen, I have just one question I want to ask Dr. James.

By the Chairman:

Q. I understand that rats are very susceptible to foot and mouth disease, is that correct?—A. That is right.

Q. And is the quarantine area one which you would say was highly infested with rats?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the only question I wanted to ask.

The WITNESS: There is some infestation of rats in this part of the country.

Mr. HETLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we adjourn until tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Agreed.

The committee adjourned.

Appendix "A"

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PRODUCTION SERVICE—HEALTH OF ANIMALS DIVISION

OTTAWA, April 18, 1951

To: All Canadian Veterinarians.

Subject: Foot and Mouth Disease.

Foot and Mouth Disease occurs as a very serious and explosively infectious disease of cattle, other ruminants and swine throughout most countries of the world. Countries presently free of this disease include Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America.

The causative agent is a virus, the particles of which measure about 8 to 12 millicrons. There are five or six types of the virus which are not recognized as immunologically distinct. It would also appear there are certain strains within the various types which influence spread and pathogenicity. In some outbreaks the spread is very rapid, in others quite slow. Mortality may be quite high, or very low. Cattle develop a strong but not lasting resistance to re-infection following recovery. Swine less so. Even in outbreaks where the mortality is very low (on account of loss of condition, interference with lactation, damage to udders, perhaps permanent lameness, sterility, and the difficulty or impossibility of restoring the recovered animal to its former condition) radical methods are indicated in dealing with this disease, except, perhaps, in countries where the disease has become so well established that it is not feasible to employ such methods.

Transmission. Natural transmission occurs most readily when an animal with recently ruptured vesicles of the oral or respiratory passages comes near

enough to healthy susceptible animals for droplet infection to take place. Experiments at Pirbright, England, indicate the most infective stage of the disease is that period when the vesicles are about to rupture or have recently ruptured, and that the virus is only rarely recoverable from animals after the 11th or 12th day after the disease makes its appearance. It must be remembered that indirect transmission may take place through the agency of feed-stuffs, fodder, clothing, boots, or any other materials which have become contaminated by vesicle or body fluids, secretions or excretions from an infected animal during the infective stage of the disease. The virus may be readily transmitted by fresh, chilled or frozen meats obtained from an infected animal, and experiments have shown the virus will survive and retain its invasiveness for 100 days or more in frozen meat. Hence the necessity of prohibiting importation of such meats from countries where the disease is present. It is very likely that birds, rodents, dogs and other non-susceptible animals may act as mechanical carriers at times.

Period of incubation. Following artificial infection of the oral mucous membrane, the incubation period is from 2 to 7 days—occasionally longer. In natural infections there is usually a rise in temperature before primary vesicles are visible. The rise of temperature indicates the virus has reached the blood stream and is being carried to other parts of the body, where it again attacks epithelial tissues, causing production of vesicles about the mouth, tongue, lips, between hooves, around the coronets, and the udder.

Clinical features. In ordinary outbreaks the mortality is not usually high; usually below 5% in cattle, somewhat higher in sheep and swine. The mortality among unweaned animals is usually quite high. Three forms of the disease are recognized: (a) benign; (b) intermediate, or the toxic form; (c) malignant form with heart and skeletal muscle involvement in addition to lesions of dermo-stomatitis. In this latter form the symptoms are very severe; the temperature may be very high with very great prostration, rapid pulse and respiration, with death occurring within a short time from heart failure.

Symptoms: Fever—which may be slight in older animals. With the fever there is diminished appetite and protracted rumination. The affected animal is dull and motionless; there will be long, viscid streamers of saliva hanging from the mouth and lips. The primary vesicle may not be detected, but about the second or third day of illness vesicles will be visible on the inner surfaces of the lips, cheeks, tongue, fraenum and dental pad. The vesicles may reach the size of a small egg, and are thick-walled on the tongue but thin-walled elsewhere. They contain a clear, or straw-colored fluid, which becomes somewhat turbid when the vesicle is about to rupture. After one to three days the vesicles rupture, exposing moist, red and very painful erosions surrounded by white or grey borders. Within a few days the erosions become covered with new epithelium, and the animal commences to feed. Vesicles sometimes appear around the base of the horns, on the muzzle, on the nasal mucosa, on the conjunctiva, and external genitals. The foot is usually affected at the same time as other parts. The skin of the coronet, and tissues of the pad and cleft, become hot and painful. Small vesicles appear and soon reach the size of a hazel nut. These rupture after two or three days. Stiffness and lameness which usually appear with or shortly after the rise of temperature, may be mistaken for a form of laminitis during the early stages of the disease.

In sheep and goats, clinical signs may be mild enough to escape notice. However, very serious infections do occur, and among lambs the mortality may be very high. In swine, the disease appears to exert its greatest effect on the feet; vesicles sometimes developing from the feet to the level of the tarsal and carpal joints. Lameness is likely to be an outstanding symptom of this disease in swine. As with other unweaned susceptible animals, the mortality among unweaned swine is very high.

Post-Mortem findings. In addition to what is visible by clinical examination, vesicles, ulcers or erosions may be found in the mucosae of the pharynx, oesophagus, bronchi, stomachs and intestines. Ulcers may be deep or shallow depending on location, raw and reddened, or covered with fibrin according to the age of the lesion. The intestinal mucosae may show transverse red stripes, and perhaps punctiform haemorrhages. There may be sub-pericardial ecchymoses, and the pericardium may contain an abnormal amount of serous fluid. There may be serous infiltration of subcutaneous tissues at the entrance to the thorax, and at other points. Changes occur in the skeletal muscles. These changes are not always visible macroscopically. However, in calves these changes take the form of a general myositis; muscles of the upper parts of the limbs tend to undergo hyalinization with deposition of calcium salts. In adult cattle the lesions are found chiefly in the thigh muscles; they may be hyaline, haemorrhagic, or necrotic due to secondary infection. In the malignant form the heart and skeletal muscle changes are more pronounced; the heart is flabby, dilated, and shows grey or yellowish streaks and spots, indicating degenerative changes.

Diagnosis. The presence, or evidence of previous existence of vesicle formation in the mouth, in the region of the feet, or both, is a characteristic of foot and mouth disease. Vesicles rupture within two or three days, and open lesions with well marked fibrous tissue margins will be evident after seven or ten days. Other features of the disease, important in establishing a diagnosis, have been described above.

There are a number of other vesicular diseases of animals which must be differentiated from foot and mouth disease, such as vesicular stomatitis. This disease affects most domestic animals, including the horse, but is not so severe in cattle as foot and mouth disease, does not spread so rapidly, and does not usually produce foot, udder, or teat lesions. Swine are readily affected; lesions produced are quite severe and are clinically indistinguishable from those of foot and mouth disease.

Vesicular exanthema has been described in connection with raw-garbage fed swine in California, the lesions being clinically identical with those of foot and mouth disease. There are said to be four or five different strains of the virus. However, cattle cannot be infected, though it is possible to infect the horse with some of the strains of this virus.

Diagnosis is confirmed by animal inoculations carried out at the site of the outbreak or suspected outbreak. Test animals being brought in from a distance and from areas where vesicular diseases have not existed. The actual test inoculations are carried out by specially trained veterinarians.

Introduction of foot and mouth disease into Canada would be disastrous to the livestock industry, particularly if the disease could not be promptly localized and eradicated. The immediate effects are summarized as follows: Prompt action by the United States authorities prohibiting the entry of all susceptible Canadian livestock, livestock products, and any other products or materials that might carry the infection into that country. Even though any such outbreak were promptly localized and eradicated, it is probable that at least six months would elapse before the United States market would be reopened to Canadian livestock and livestock products. Further, the establishment of comprehensive quarantine restrictions for the purpose of controlling and eradicating an outbreak of this disease, would, in addition to preventing the movement of all livestock either into or out of the quarantined area, impose very severe restrictions on all traffic, movement of people and commodities. Half measures would be quite useless.

It is possible the virus of foot and mouth disease might be introduced into Canada, perhaps mixed with other types of virus to create difficulties in diagnosis. Therefore, all veterinarians are requested to watch closely for any indication of vesicular disease, and, if seen or suspected, to exercise

the greatest possible care in handling infected animals and to be particularly careful not to carry infection from the premises where it may be found. The best procedure would be to remain on the premises, notify the nearest Health of Animals Division veterinarian, await his coming in order to brief him thoroughly on conditions found, and assist him in all possible ways to make sure the danger of spread is thoroughly taken care of by strict quarantine and other appropriate measures until a definite diagnosis can be made. Extreme caution and careful, thorough observance of quarantine procedures, in even the most innocuous appearing cases of vesicular diseases, might be the means of saving the Canadian livestock industry from disaster, and the national economy from a severe setback.

Practitioners should keep in mind that:—

- (a) Any vesicular disease of animals may be very dangerous.
- (b) It should be promptly reported to the nearest Departmental veterinarian who will appreciate your co-operation in taking appropriate measures to prevent spread.
- (c) Diagnosis must be established on the premises where disease is found.
- (d) Under no circumstances whatever should samples or specimens be picked up for laboratory examination or animal inoculation. Diagnostic procedures, where indicated, must be carried out on the premises where disease exists or is suspected to exist.

I would ask you all to keep a careful and constant watch for vesicular diseases, and any other abnormal conditions which might indicate the presence of a serious animal disease, and report promptly any abnormal conditions that might come to your notice. Canada has always been kept free of the more serious animal plagues, and with the co-operation of all Canadian veterinarians, no really serious animal disease can become established in our country. A healthy and adequate livestock population ensures prosperity for the veterinarian.

T. CHILDS,
Veterinary Director General.

36

HD
1781
A38
1952
No 5

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.)

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

No. 5

TUESDAY, MAY 6, 1952

WITNESSES:

Dr. C. A. Mitchell, Chief, Division of Animal Pathology; Dr. Orlan Hall, Assistant Veterinary Director General, and Dr. K. F. Wells, Chief Veterinarian, Contagious Diseases, Department of Agriculture.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1952



MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, May 6, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Aylesworth, Bater, Bennett, Blue, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Cardiff, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Decore, Dumas, Fair, Gardiner, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jutras, Kickham, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), MacKenzie, Masse, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Oxford*), Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Roberge, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, Whitman, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Dr. C. A. Mitchell, Chief, Division of Animal Pathology, Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Wright placed certain questions on the record, to be answered by Dr. James in writing.

Dr. Mitchell was called, questioned and retired.

At 1 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 4 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Browne (*St. John's West*), Bruneau, Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Decore, Dumas, Fair, Gardiner, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kickham, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, MacLean (*Queens, P.E.I.*), Major, Masse, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Dr. Orlan Hall, Assistant Veterinary Director General, Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Hall was called and questioned.

At 6 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 8 o'clock p.m. this day.

EVENING SITTING

The Committee resumed at 8 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bruneau, Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Decore, Dumas, Fair,

Fontaine, Gardiner, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kickham, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, MacLean (*Queen's P.E.I.*), Major, Masse McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Oxford*), Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Roberge, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Dr. Orlan Hall, Assistant Veterinary Director General, and Dr. K. F. Wells, Chief Veterinarian, Contagious Diseases, Department of Agriculture.

Examination of Dr. Hall was continued.

Dr. Hall was retired.

Dr. Wells was called, questioned and retired.

Mr. Blue moved that no further evidence be taken regarding the prevalence of foot and mouth disease, and that the Committee report its conclusions to the House forthwith.

After discussion, and by leave of the Committee, Mr. Blue withdrew his motion.

On motion of Mr. Wylie, at 10.55 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

MAY 6, 1952.
11.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you kindly come to order, gentlemen? We have with us this morning Dr. C. A. Mitchell, the chief of the Division of Animal Pathology. I will now call upon Dr. Mitchell.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, before Dr. Mitchell is called, last night when Dr. James was giving evidence, someone moved the adjournment of the committee and I had some further questions which I wished to ask Dr. James. Rather than hold him, I think it was the understanding that the questions which I had to ask would be placed on the record and Dr. James would send in written answers to them. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

Mr. WRIGHT: Then, may I now place the questions on the agenda?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: Dr. James made a report with regard to conditions at the Saskatchewan Cooperative Livestock Producers Limited, Regina, Saskatchewan, on January 4. In that report this is stated:

On January 4, 1952 I again visited these premises and inspected 100 cattle and 50 hogs and found them all in apparent good health. This action was taken on account of the fact that a cow which arrived at these yards for sale on Dec. 31, 1951 was slaughtered at the abattoir of Burns & Co., Regina, on Jan. 3, 1952 and found on post-mortem examination to have several large areas of skin and mucous membrane loosened and sloughing from the tongue. In this case, the head only was condemned. The rest of the carcass was found to be normal with no inflammatory conditions and with a normal temperature. Efforts are being made to trace the origin of this animal by the eartag number. Also a Hereford bull purchased from a Mr. Beepfulg of Hitchcock, Sask., and delivered to the pool yards Jan. 2, 1952 was repurchased by Fuhman & Co., butchers of Regina and was taken directly to the killing floor of Burns & Co., and slaughtered and on post-mortem inspection was found to have stomatitis, the skin on the tongue was sloughing in several places. This animal's head was also condemned and the carcass approved for food.

The questions which I wish to ask Dr. James are the following:

1. Will Dr. James comment on why the rest of these carcasses were allowed to be distributed to the trade?
2. Has the first cow mentioned in this report been traced through the eartag number?
3. Has the herd from which the bull came from been destroyed?
4. Is this herd in the neighbourhood of or have persons who were in contact with this herd been on any of the farms recently infected in the Weyburn area?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Might I just suggest that you put one more question on, to get the exact date that those animals came out of the yard and went to the Burns plant and the day they were slaughtered?

Mr. WRIGHT: That is already stated here, I think.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It is on the cows but I do not think it is on the bull.

Mr. WRIGHT: "Also a Hereford bull purchased from a Mr. Beepfulg of Hitchcock, Sask., and delivered to the pool yards Jan. 2, 1952 was repurchased by Fuhman & Co., butchers of Regina and was taken directly to the killing floor of Burns & Co., and slaughtered..." That would be a perfectly legitimate question but why I asked with respect to the Weyburn incident is that it states in this report:

This owner's premises adjacent to the Weyburn sub-district will be visited and cattle and livestock will be inspected to ascertain if stomatitis is present among the animals on this premises.

So that I do not know just where the geographical location of the Weyburn sub-district is, but what I am trying to find out is if the Weyburn sub-district is anywhere near where this recent outbreak was found.

The fifth question is:

5. What is the result and report of the veterinarian who visited these premises adjacent to the Weyburn sub-district?

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Dr. C. A. Mitchell, chief of the Division of Animal Pathology.

Dr. C. A. Mitchell, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and hon. members, because the division which I represent was brought into the picture rather late, I, of course, have very little factual information to disclose. I think, however, it might be advisable to sketch in the facilities which we have, how they have come to be developed and a few pertinent questions in relationship to the more scientific aspects of vesicular diseases because I am sure you must be interested in these from the questions I have heard asked in the last few days.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Before you start, Dr. Mitchell, I would suggest you proceed like the other witnesses—you may not like to give it, but to give your time of appointment, your experience and qualifications so that the committee will know what weight to put on your evidence.—A. It is rather hard for a Scotch Presbyterian to proceed that way. I was appointed thirty-seven years ago and ten years ago I became chief of the Division of Animal Pathology. I have had, of course, a great deal of connection with diseases generally and particularly virus diseases and have studied from time to time in the Pirbright Institute of Virus Research in England where only foot and mouth disease is dealt with.

Q. And your academic qualifications, if any?—A. I had the usual high school training, two years in arts, graduated from the Ontario Veterinary College.

Turning now to the problem which lies before all modern countries, namely, of having facilities available in which these spreading forms of disease may be studied without spreading out into the surrounding country, I should like to establish and point out that Canada in that respect is particularly favoured. It came about this way, that during the last war a considerable amount of fear was felt regarding the introduction of animal diseases and for this reason a so-called virus unit was established in this country which was subsequently followed by the establishment of a similar unit at Hull, Quebec, for the particular purpose of studying virus diseases.

The studying of these diseases requires a special laboratory, different from the ordinary bacteriological laboratory—just as different as a bacteriological

laboratory differs from a chemical laboratory. It must have all the facilities for disposal of affluent air, feces from animals and things of that kind which go to make the whole matter perfectly safe. In addition to that, workers have to be trained in certain ways and must be protected in certain manners, requiring a great deal of engineering and a great deal of special apparatus and special facilities.

We in Canada now have had the advantage of that and it is only now that the United States is getting around to having a similar institution. That is one of the reasons why we can look upon these spreading diseases with a little different attitude than do some of the other countries.

In so far as the Division of Animal Pathology is concerned, our work is confined, of course, to either diagnoses or preparation of facilities for diagnoses. I am not speaking of research but only in so far as it touches matters of control, we only do diagnoses or prepare facilities for that purpose. Now that means of course that we must keep in contact with the advances in the world in matters pertaining to research in different diseases and to attempt, if possible, to establish those conditions in Canada which are favourable for diagnosis of conditions in this country.

We do not have anything to do with control. Facilities are established and if it seems desirable on the part of persons who are engaged in control work to use these facilities, they are there, but otherwise we take no part whatsoever in attempting to force any method of diagnosis or anything of that kind upon persons who are required by their authority to exercise certain responsibilities.

In regard to this particular question of foot and mouth disease, the question I am sure which is before you or which is in your minds must relate somewhat to diagnosis. Without a knowledge of some of the fundamental background it is very difficult indeed to have an understanding of this particular question. If you will bear with me just a few minutes I will try to sketch in very roughly indeed some of the facts which I think are pertinent to all this matter.

First of all, you know that foot and mouth disease and the different vesicular diseases are virus diseases. Foot and mouth disease historically is the oldest virus disease known because the causative agent of that disease was discovered first of all. It is also the smallest known agent which will produce disease and perhaps because of that we have its unusual spreading capacity.

Very little progress was made until about 1922, in which year two or three discoveries—from 1922 to 1926—changed the whole complexion of this particular problem and our knowledge of it. It was discovered at that time that there are different types—three different types in those days, of virus, now known as A, O and C. Now “type” in this case does not mean greater invasiveness or any characteristic of that kind, but it simply means that an animal recovering from, let us say, Type A is susceptible to Type O or Type C. Of course, one recovering from “C” or “O” is susceptible to “A”; in other words, the invasion by one type confers no immunity in regard to other types. That became a very important feature in regard to not only diagnoses but to the epidemiology, or following from place to place the spread of certain infections.

The next discovery was that of virus producing a disease which had been mistaken for years for foot and mouth disease, producing exactly the same symptoms but which failed to spread to any great extent and which tended to die off and fade away. That disease, of course, is known as vesicular stomatitis. It was later discovered that there are at least two types of other virus of this infection.

Later, in 1932, when California had been tied up for a number of months at great cost to the United States, it was found that a disease there, thought to be foot and mouth disease, was something else—a new virus was present, known now as vesicular exanthema of swine and of that alone to the present time there are four types, so that we see this multiplicity of type of three

infections which are to some extent related one to the other. We do not know yet by any means how many other vesicular viruses there may be in the world. There may be still be others that are not captured.

All this brought up the question of distinguishing one virus from another and in fact one type from another, and as a result of studies over a great number of years it was found that there were certain susceptibilities in regard to animals. Now, these susceptibilities are not always the same that is they are not always constant, although they are almost always constant. For instance, man—few men become infected with foot and mouth disease virus; a very few men. The susceptibility of a species is not always constant but it is almost always constant. That is the best science had to offer in distinguishing between them for many years and so it was arranged that by using the horse, the cow and the pig and the guinea pig and taking into account the susceptibility of one species from another that in general you can arrive at a diagnosis and a conclusion of what virus you are dealing with.

However, there is always the feeling in the minds of persons who are working with them that there may be certain instances in which that means of diagnosis lets you down. So there came to be studied very extensively and particularly in Pirbright, England, a method of examination which would supplement and now in large measure in England has replaced the method of animal inoculation alone. That very successful piece of work was done by one who was a graduate of a Scottish university but who took his post-graduate degree in Canada, and I am very glad to know that he has contributed to this difficult problem such splendid assistance.

That scheme is based on this fact, that protein injected into an animal will produce an anti-serum which will combine with that protein outside the body and because of that—a fact which was discovered by Nuttall—and is exploited in the identification of blood in medico-legal work; because of that you are able to tell one type of virus absolutely from the other type and, of course, at the same time one virus from another.

Knowing that work had been carried out so successfully, we were, of course, interested in it and arranged to study the technique, which I did personally, to have available the required substances for the purpose. The exceptions in a herd is one of the reasons for using this special technique. As virology grew and we got to know more about these things, it was found that horses, other animals and persons too could harbour a virus in a latent form which does them no harm but which, when there is an insult to the tissue, will flare out into the infection it is capable of causing. That, of course, is what you must be familiar with in the case of the "cold-sore". A "cold-sore" is a virus disease. It only occurs when there is an insult to the tissue. It flares up but it is latent there all the time. And so it is in some instances that horses or other animals may be carrying a latent virus and some insult to the tissue whether with foot and mouth virus or any foreign substance will bring the latent virus up into its pathogenic role producing not the disease caused by the virus you inoculate but the disease caused by the virus which was latently there. That, of course, is one of the fears which persons had who were working in the field of foot and mouth disease—in case this did occasionally occur, in horses leading to a false diagnosis.

Turning to our actual contact with this the episode; my first knowledge of it was on February 12 when Dr. Hall phoned me and asked if I had heard about a vesicular disease in western Canada. Well, I had not heard about that disease. Then he went on to say that Dr. Carlson, who was here yesterday, took a rather dim view of the whole problem and Dr. Hall suggested that I send someone out west to view these animals. I told him that in my opinion this would be a waste of time. Vesicular diseases are treacherous and the only sensible thing was to get specimens in as soon as possible and because we have

a virus unit all the necessary work can be done perfectly safely. Therefore the logical step was to send those specimens in. Dr. Hall agreed with that and four days later the specimens arrived.

In the interval, however, in fact on the 13th of February, I radiogrammed England and asked them to send out here our serum which was sitting there in the refrigerator. It arrived about three days later, so that actually the serum arrived before we were ready for it.

All this leads up to the inoculation of horses, pigs, cattle, guinea pigs and chick embryos, all to determine whether it was foot and mouth disease virus and as soon as we had any tissue to harvest serological work commenced. By the time the 18th arrived we were beginning to take a very dim view of the episode as we thought our animals were coming down in a manner which very much suggested foot and mouth disease virus. So I phoned Mr. Young's office or perhaps he called me that morning and I told him the results, also that I thought they should consider it tentatively as foot and mouth disease until we had an opportunity of studying it in some greater detail.

We ran a second series of animals to make absolutely sure. We ran five serological tests in all, five different serological runs, and we came up with the same answer, namely, that here we had in our presence foot and mouth disease virus, type A. That was, of course, reported immediately and from there on you have heard the story.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. What date was that?—A. The 24th. I think there is nothing to add to that and I turn now to a problem that has been forced on my doorstep, namely, this wretched Waas diseased herd. On March 3, while I was absent from Ottawa, Mr. Young phoned my office and conversing with Dr. Plummer, who was acting in my stead; he wanted to know how one could tell if the Waas herd was infected. Dr. Plummer suggested the neutralization test and they arranged—Mr. Young and Dr. Plummer between them—that samples would be collected by Dr. Wells, I believe, and sent down. When those samples arrived, I found that our cubicles were full to overflowing and it would be impossible at that time to test these without seriously interfering with the emergency work that was going on, and so I suggested an alternative and in fact a better method of dealing with this question, namely, the inoculation of type A foot and mouth disease virus into the tongues of these cattle. Mr. Young agreed to this after consulting with his officials and asked me to send the material to western Canada, which I did.

It was some time before I saw a report and then I just had a casual glance at it. A few days ago I was presented with this report for review and for a determination of whether the tests showed that the animals had been infected or not. I may say that proof and past experience with foot and mouth disease virus is that the animals do not become infected when challenged with foot and mouth disease virus if they have recently been infected with this type of virus. On the other hand, if they have not experienced the disease, they definitely do become infected without difficulty. Of these animals I found that there are 38 of them; 7 of them became infected. One of them was a calf born after the episode took place so we can rule that one out. Thirty-one gave no reaction whatsoever to the inoculation of the virus—consequently those animals must have been infected. Supplementing that and after we had a little elbow room in our cubicles, we took the serum which had been sent down to us and conducted what is known as the Henderson test. The Henderson test is one which was devised by Henderson of Pirbright and it is quite useful for this particular purpose. It is simply a neutralization test by an animal which has been infected neutralizing the virus and therefore infection fails to take place when you

inoculate that virus into a live, healthy and susceptible animal. We did not feel like using up 38 cattle, examining 38 animals. In fact, we did not have the room so we pooled these 38 samples into six different pools.

Of those six different pools, five of them have given definite total neutralization. One pool gave slight neutralization but not as complete. The control animal was violently affected and the control animal which had the virus plus normal serum was also violently affected. Again this showed from the samples that this herd was infected with type A virus.

We would have liked to carry this study further and to have examined the cattle for vesicular stomatitis. Unfortunately, we only had one pool with any substantial amount of serum and for that reason were only able to do that pool. We did not find the presence of vesicular stomatitis but, of course, that does not mean much since that part of the study was incomplete.

We also would have liked to have examined serum from the horse—very much liked to have examined the serum from that horse; and we would certainly have liked to have examined the vesicular tissue which was eroded from that horse because that would have been a clue as to what actually did take place in that inoculation.

I do not think there is anything I can add further to that at the present moment.

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. There is one thing I would like to ask about the last infection. Am I correct in saying that those tests were spread over three days and that the animals were destroyed on the fourth day?—A. I do not know. I did not do those tests myself. I have only the report, but I believe it was seventy-two hours they were kept. They were destroyed almost immediately after the test was made.

MR. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, in that regard, I have a report on the file. The inoculations were made, I understood by the report, on the 9th and the cattle were slaughtered on the 14th—five days.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Just four days from the time the tests were made until they were slaughtered.

MR. CHARLTON: Well, the report I received is not correct then?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, I am not sure. I was out there at the time but that can be verified.

MR. CHARLTON: It is not correct to say that they were tested on the 9th and buried on the 14th?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, I would have to have the record.

The WITNESS: May I answer that question?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Certainly.

The WITNESS: According to this record, presuming the animals were destroyed at the end of the test, they were destroyed on the ninety-sixth hour.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Now, Dr. Mitchell, I am sure I can speak on behalf of the committee in thanking you very much for your very instructive address this morning. I am sure we have all learned a good deal. Dr. Mitchell, in your experience as head of the animal division research in Hull, do you feel you have always had the full co-operation of the Health of Animals branch in anything that has been done?—A. Oh, yes, I think we have.

Q. And any time that the Health of Animals division thought it necessary to ask for your assistance and aid, that has been done?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you ever at any time up to the 12th of February consulted by any official of the Department of Agriculture?—A. No, sir.

Q. You were not?—A. No.

Q. Naturally in the position in which you are, you have said this morning, you would have to be asked before you could do anything; it is not your job to go out in the field to find out where disease is?—A. That is correct.

Q. Now, there is another point I would like to have you clear up if you would. It was stated by one of the witnesses yesterday, Dr. Carlson, that the delay in diagnosis would not make much particular difference in the spread of the disease, that is, the delay in the diagnosis from December to February he did not think in his opinion had much to do with the spread of the disease in the Regina area. Do you agree with that statement?—A. Well, I would not know, sir. I think that is a matter of personal experience. It would be very difficult for me to tell without being on the spot. I would think if I was just looking at it casually, that it would likely spread if it was not confined, but that is only my opinion.

Q. I probably should not have asked you that question. You might think I was putting you on the spot, but it did sound rather strange with the disease not having been diagnosed.

Mr. STEWART: If the doctor would avoid making speeches. I am objecting on a point of order. He consistently makes statements and comments of his own as a veterinarian. I think if he would question the witness—if the doctor wants to give evidence, then some of us would like to cross-examine him because I understand he was a schoolmate of the other fellow who gave evidence yesterday and if that is the fact he has a certain knowledge and we would like to cross-examine the doctor, but if he is going to make statements to this committee then we want to question him.

Mr. CHARLTON: I do not think I have made any more statements than my hon. friend has.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mitchell, is it dangerous procedure having these samples sent from the field to the laboratory at Hull?—A. No, I would not recommend it if I thought it was dangerous.

Q. It was also stated by one of the witnesses yesterday that it had been Department of Agriculture policy, as long as he remembered, that these samples be not sent to the laboratory at Hull. Did you know of any such ruling?—A. No, I know of no such ruling; it has been common practice to send samples with consent or under instruction from the head of the branch or head of the division. I know that we have received vesicular samples over the years.

Q. You have received them?—A. Yes, and then always, of course, sent on the instructions of the particular head of the division.

Q. Oh, yes, I agree with that. It would be very dangerous to have anybody send them in. It would have to be with the consent or under the instructions of the head of the division, but in the case of the outbreak in Regina in 1938, I believe it was, were there any vesicular disease samples sent in at that time, do you recall?—A. Yes. I am not sure whether it was from Regina or Manitoba. That is dim in my memory, but I know there were samples sent in because we have the viruses yet.

Q. Then there have been samples sent in previously?—A. Yes.

Q. And within a very reasonable time past?—A. Yes.

Q. What, Dr. Mitchell, in your opinion, does the word "aphthous" mean when it is used?—A. Well, aphthous fever means foot and mouth disease to me but I do not know what "aphthous" means excepting it refers to the mouth. "Aphthous" alone means nothing.

Q. Well, it would not be a fair question to say that if you saw "aphthous" written on a report, you would not draw any conclusion from it particularly?—

A. I would think he had forgotten the noun.

Q. Now, you have answered the next question for me regarding the Waas herd. I have been over this report for some time and you have given it to us this morning. There can be no doubt in the minds of anyone now that it was vesicular stomatitis in the Waas herd. You have answered that question, that it was definitely foot and mouth disease as proven by experiment and inoculation?—A. I did not answer that question. Could I answer it?

Q. Yes.—A. I did not answer this question because we do not have the whole serological evidence. If there was another infection there—that is one of the dreads of virus people, that you have two running as a team—but I do not know that vesicular stomatitis was not there.

Q. You cannot say for sure that vesicular stomatitis was not there as well?—A. No.

Q. But you do know there was foot and mouth virus there?—A. Yes, that is right.

Q. Now, this is the first time we have had any definite information that there was foot and mouth disease in the Waas herd, but wouldn't it seem rather strange to you that if it were not suspected there would be so much detail work done on the immigrant Willi Bruntjen if it had not been feared that there was foot and mouth disease there?—A. Well, when Willi Bruntjen came into the picture we knew, of course, that there was foot and mouth disease in the country and he was turned up as the only likely connection.

Q. You would not have carried on all the tests on this immigrant if you had not thought there was foot and mouth disease in the Waas herd, would you?—A. No.

Q. That is what he was brought in for?—A. Yes.

Q. To try and find out if he had brought the disease. The fact that he came from the Waas herd was evidence enough that you thought it necessary to go ahead and examine this particular immigrant?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, how long would it ordinarily take in your opinion for a positive reaction in a horse after being artificially inoculated with the virus of vesicular stomatitis?—A. In my opinion, in my own experience when you inoculate the virus, what you know is virus, it is a matter of 24 to probably 36 or 48 hours. It is a fairly quick manifestation. If there is a lag, it might be considered that a latent virus has been activated.

Q. You answered the next question for me and you said in some extreme cases—I do not know if you used the word "extreme" or not—but you did say in some cases foot and mouth disease would infect horses?—A. Well, the literature shows that following the inoculation of foot and mouth disease there has been vesicular eruptions in the mouths of horses but in those days the serological method was not available and it was not possible to sort out one from the other. In the literature at least there are cases where foot and mouth disease has infected horses.

Q. Would you, Dr. Mitchell, think it would be satisfactory procedure to only inoculate one or even two horses that were on infected premises in order to find out whether this was vesicular stomatitis or foot and mouth disease?—A. That is a very difficult question to answer. You have to take the whole matter into the picture, but in general I would think that two horses would be satisfactory.

Q. Would be satisfactory?—A. Yes, two horses would be satisfactory.

Q. From the infected premises?—A. Oh, I would not want them from the infected premises if possible.

Q. I included that in my questions, from the infected premises?—A. No.

Q. And of any particular age?—A. No.

Q. Then what in your considered opinion would be the proper field procedure—would you mind giving us that, the proper field procedure? For instance, under the circumstances when the head of the department did not want these samples brought in to Hull, what in your considered opinion would have been the next best step to have taken to try to find the differential diagnosis in the field?—A. The inoculation of cattle, young cattle, animals taken, of course, from a healthy district, the inoculation of pigs and the inoculation of a couple of horses.

Q. Could any veterinarian do that?

The CHAIRMAN: Your time is about up, Mr. Charlton.

Mr. CHARLTON: I have just a couple more questions, Mr. Chairman.

The WITNESS: I really do not know, I cannot answer that.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Well, you had a short course last year at the lab, did you not, to instruct veterinarians along these lines?—A. Yes.

Q. You thought it important enough to have those veterinarians come in there for special instruction. Was this inoculation work part of their instructions?—A. No, we just spoke about it, that is all.

Q. Just spoke about it?—A. Yes.

Q. As you say, it is rather difficult to say, but would not there be some special procedure in the inoculation of those animals? Would you not say there would be some special procedure to be carried out in the inoculation of those animals?—A. I am not quite sure that I grasp the question.

Q. Well, the method as used by Dr. James, as he said yesterday in committee, was that the tongue surface was scarified and a sterile toothbrush was used. He did not say where the animal was he was taking the material from or where the animal was he was injecting it into, but he just said a toothbrush was used and he scraped the vesicle of the infected animal and then placed it on the horse's tongue after scarification. Would that be a good method in your opinion?—A. That is not the method that is regularly followed in foot and mouth disease laboratories. The method there is to inoculate with the hypodermic syringe just beneath the epithelium.

Q. And draw the material from the vesicle of the infected animal?—A. Yes, if possible. It is not always possible.

Q. If there is a vesicle with material in it that has not been broken?—A. Yes.

Q. Are vesicles on the tongue ordinarily as severe in the case of vesicular stomatitis as they are in the foot and mouth disease, doctor?—A. You are comparing cattle with horses, aren't you?

Q. No, in the cattle.—A. In cattle no, not in cattle, not in general.

Q. They would not be as severe in cattle?—A. No.

Q. They would not go as deep?—A. Yes, but I do not think they are as extensive.

Q. As large?—A. No. When you inoculate into cattle that is when you inoculate an experimental lot into cattle, there is not the same extension as there is in foot and mouth disease but essentially there is not any difference in the pathological picture of the disease.

Q. But in the case of mild foot and mouth, do you think a mild case of foot and mouth disease would produce a larger lesion than a severe case of stomatitis?—A. Well, the foot and mouth disease I have seen has always been a very severe infection of the tongue.

Q. Foot and mouth disease has been a very severe infection of the tongue?—A. Yes.

Q. I do not believe you understand my question. Even in a mild case of foot and mouth disease, the stomatitis would not produce as severe a lesion on the tongue as the mild case of foot and mouth disease in cattle?—A. Again I think it is impossible to answer that because there are strains of stomatitis that do produce a very profound disturbance in the tongue.

Q. Just one more question. Would, in your opinion, vesicular stomatitis be liable to cause death in young calves?—A. No.

Q. It would not?—A. No.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Do you, Dr. Mitchell, think that you or anyone else could tell the difference by observation between foot and mouth disease and vesicular stomatitis?—A. Well, I could not, but I do not profess to be a field experienced man in this field. I know foot and mouth disease from an experimental standpoint and not from the field.

Q. Have you heard of anyone in the country where they have had a lot of experience with foot and mouth disease having the reputation of being able to tell by observation the difference between vesicular stomatitis and foot and mouth disease?—A. No, I have not.

Q. What use has been made of your laboratory in sending in vesicular samples in the last few years?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. My question is, what use has been made of your laboratory, what samples have you received of virus within the last few years?—A. Vesicular virus?

Q. Yes, foot and mouth disease or anything suspected of being that?—A. I cannot recall any samples for these last five, six or seven years, only the cattle of last winter.

Q. You have had other virus samples sent in, though?—A. Yes.

Q. And in the packaging of any of those virus samples have you had any breakages?—A. No.

Q. No breakages whatever?—A. No.

Q. So, do you think if the proper packaging procedure is followed, there is any danger of breakage?—A. No, we have done a lot of experiments on that before we recommended the method.

Q. What do you think is the best procedure to be followed when a vesicular disease appears in an animal in regard to diagnosis? What do you think is the most preferable procedure to have the vesicular disease diagnosed?—A. Well, I think the use of the serological method which is so precise should be employed whether you inoculate the animals in the field or not. Certainly the serological method should be employed as a supplementary method because it is much more precise.

Q. Then, do you feel that a serious mistake was made when the samples were not sent immediately or almost immediately to your laboratory for a proper test?—A. That is an extremely difficult question for me to answer because first of all I do not know all the background; I was not there. I do not know what I would have done under the same circumstances and I would not like to express an opinion on that. I do not know all the circumstances.

Q. Do you think the best procedure is to send samples to the laboratory?—A. I agree with that, yes.

Q. And therefore the best procedure was not followed? I think that follows from that?

Mr. STEWART: He has not said that.

Mr. ARGUE: But he said the best procedure was to have a sample sent to the laboratory and I will say that the best procedure was not followed and because the best procedure was not followed we have much of the loss that we are facing now just on that account.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Just one further question. Now, what was the date of the report that you read to the committee on which it was shown that there was foot and mouth disease in the Waas herd?—A. The official report?

Q. The report you read from this morning?—A. The inoculations were made on March 9.

Q. And when was the report made?—A. I do not know when the report was made, but the last readings were made four days later, ninety-six hours later. When the report was made it does not show, so I do not know.

Q. That would be four days later than the first inoculation. When was the first inoculation?—A. March 9.

Q. So that evidence was available on March 13; we know that. The final report was made?—A. Yes.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I cannot for the life of me understand why that evidence has not been produced in the House or produced to this committee long before. We have been going around in the dark now for almost a week and this most important piece of evidence has been withheld from the committee until this morning.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Mr. Chairman and Dr. Mitchell, you say that this disease could have spread before the final test. Don't you think that Dr. Carlson and the field men there took the necessary precautions? In your own mind are you satisfied that they took those precautions?—A. Well, I know Dr. Carlson fairly well and I know he is a very able man and I would expect he took what he thought were the proper precautions.

Q. He would be satisfied that the disease would not spread when he put in quarantine?—A. That is not my field.

Q. That is your opinion?—A. Yes.

Q. You say that a horse can carry the foot and mouth disease virus?—A. No, vesicular stomatitis.

Q. I thought you said something about a broken tissue, that it could be inoculated. That was only for stomatitis, was it?—A. Yes.

Q. And a horse could carry stomatitis for some time?—A. He could carry vesicular stomatitis for some time, but not foot and mouth disease.

Q. Until the tissue would break?—A. Yes.

Q. These horses, they were infected on the Waas farm. Now, what would that indicate to you? Would that indicate stomatitis or foot and mouth disease?—A. Well, that would suggest stomatitis or some particular virus we are not conversant with.

Q. But not foot and mouth disease?—A. No, not likely to be foot and mouth disease unless it is a very unusual strain.

Q. And these horses were affected. Would that indicate that the cattle were infected with stomatitis?—A. Not necessarily. As I tried to explain, the horses might be carrying a latent virus and if you inoculated a horse with water it would still produce this stomatitis.

Q. He would have to have the virus?—A. Well, the virus is there to start with.

Q. In the horse?—A. Yes.

Q. That would indicate to you they had stomatitis on the Waas farm?—A. Stomatitis in the horses, of course.

Q. That would be the natural thing to suspect, wouldn't it?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, I think Dr. Charlton asked you this question. I did not quite get it. Could a mild case of foot and mouth disease produce the same effect as stomatitis on the tongue or in the mouth?—A. Yes.

Q. It could?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, when you experiment on cattle in Hull, can the cattle experience a more severe case of foot and mouth disease than the case of foot and mouth disease in the country or in the field? Do you understand what I am trying to get at?—A. Yes.

Q. A critter that has taken this foot and mouth disease in the country, could it have a milder case than the ones that you have in Hull?—A. Yes, that is always the experience, it is generally the experience with foot and mouth disease. When infection breaks into the country it is milder and then when it jumps from one herd to another it picks up in virulence.

Q. But whenever you have a case in Hull, it usually turns out to be a serious case, doesn't it?—A. An inoculation, you mean?

Q. Yes, when you experiment in Hull. I am trying to get this point. When you experiment in Hull your cattle or your pigs usually have a severe case of foot and mouth disease?—A. By comparison with the ones in the country?

Q. Yes, that is what I am trying to get at.—A. Well, we have not had enough experience of the Canadian virus.

Q. You inject this virus into the animal?—A. Yes.

Q. You naturally will inject enough so that you are sure this animal will take this disease?—A. Yes.

Q. So you have a more serious disease in your laboratory at Hull than you would in the country?—A. Yes, and in the second serial passage it is more severe still.

Q. That is what I was trying to get at. I am trying to be fair to the people or the vets in the country. They might have diagnosed this thing wrong in the first place but that does not make any difference; I am trying to be fair to them, that they could easily make this mistake?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Dr. Mitchell, isn't it the experience in England that horses sometimes have foot and mouth disease?—A. That experience which was known a few years ago is in large measure upset now by the fact that it appears to be the activation of the stomatitis virus, or stomatitis and foot and mouth disease together.

Q. But you are not talking definitely now; you say "sometimes." Do you know? Can you say definitely that horses never get foot and mouth disease?—A. I would say that within these last two years since precise methods for determining its presence have been available, that there is no record of horses getting foot and mouth disease. I cannot tell before that time because it is behind a cloud.

Q. The contagion of this disease is terrific, I understand?—A. Yes.

Q. And it spreads not only by contact, say, with the urine or manure or excretion but even by contact from people's shoes, who have been walking around, even by the breath of the animals?—A. Yes.

Q. And, therefore, some care has to be taken. Now, is it possible that in connection with artificial insemination I understand there are bulls kept out on the dominion farms, that it might be spread in that way?—A. I suppose it is possible. I do not know of a case on record where it has been spread, but it is possible.

Q. If these bulls, as I understand, were infected with the disease and any artificial insemination took place, if they were infected it might spread?—A. It is possible.

Q. In connection with the dead animal, supposing if its disease arose in the Waas herd, then the animal was slaughtered and sold, could the disease still exist in the meat?—A. It will exist in the bone marrow.

Q. Will it exist in the meat itself?—A. It does not exist very long in the meat itself.

Q. In the blood?—A. No, for the simple reason that in rigor mortis there is a change in the acidity of the flesh and any great change in the acidity of the flesh will kill the virus.

Q. There was a case referred to by Mr. Wright this morning where the head was diseased and yet the rest of the carcass was permitted to be used for human consumption. Do you approve of such procedure?—A. No, the marrow of the bones is dangerous.

Q. Well, when you buy meat, you usually buy bones?—A. Yes.

Q. When you are cooking beefsteak, you cook the meat with the bones in it?—A. Yes.

Q. Isn't there a danger of transmitting the disease to even humans in that way?—A. Not if it is cooked.

Q. Well, sometimes germs have to be cooked a very long time before they are destroyed?—A. Not a virus.

Q. Well, put it this way, there is a possibility of the disease being transmitted to the selling of meat from infected cattle?—A. Yes.

Q. Great studies have been made in this disease, I believe, in Europe for many years. What time were you in England when you studied this?—A. I just came back in December.

Q. Did they have any outbreak at that time while you were there?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. They have it at the present time; they had it while you were there?—A. Yes.

Q. So we might look upon you then as an expert in this line?—A. I am not an expert but I saw it.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Mitchell has just said a little while ago that in case of outbreak in Canada it would have been expected that it would be mild—is that right, because we had never had an outbreak here before?—A. The usual experience is that when a virus disease is brought into a country the original outbreak is mild.

Q. And that fact would be known to the officials in the various departments associated with contagious diseases in Canada, I presume?—A. I would think so, yes.

Q. So they would naturally be expecting that if an outbreak of foot and mouth disease did occur, it would be in mild form, at least in its primary or first stages?—A. Yes.

Q. You said also that your department is used by the various other branches dealing with health of animals, that you only diagnose samples as they are sent in to you. How many samples have you received from the contagious diseases branch under Dr. Childs for each of the last three years for determining what they may be?—A. Including blood samples, I would think probably 100,000.

Q. 100,000 samples?—A. Yes.

Q. That is for the detection of various diseases with which they are dealing?—A. Yes.

Q. How many samples in connection with virus disease?—A. I cannot tell you, but the number of samples would be few in connection with virus because there is very little virus infection.

Q. You also carry on examinations for other departments, do you, in the government besides the Health of Animals branch?—A. Well, we have

some material from the experimental farms and places of that kind but it is a very limited amount of material in comparison with the Health of Animals division.

Q. Is your department used by any of the provincial governments, their Health of Animals branches?—A. Where there is a virus disease that they are afraid to work with in their own department they send it to us.

Q. How many such samples have you received?—A. Oh, I don't know. This last year a good number. I would just be guessing I would say probably 1,200.

Q. You said in your evidence that you would have liked very much to have had some of the tissue from the horses that were inoculated. I presume that was the first horse on the Waas farm, the first horse inoculated.—A. Yes.

Q. Did Dr. James, to your knowledge, retain any of these tissues when he examined the horses?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Did you make any request to Dr. James asking him if he had retained any of these tissues?—A. No, our interest in that tissue was after all this work was done and we were looking backwards.

Q. Do you think that a correct determination as to what that horse had could be made by simply looking at the lesions on the tongue without taking a sample and submitting it for test?—A. Not with any precision.

Q. I think that was all I had.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. Dr. Mitchell, is it true that the practice in the United States is to have a diagnosis made right on the premises rather than forwarding the virus to some central point or some laboratory?—A. That is true, but they have no laboratory in the United States; they have no virus centre.

Q. I understand they have some island or some place?—A. It is not developed yet. That is what it is being developed for.

Q. Is that the reason why in the United States they make these diagnoses right on the premises?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. That is in the States, doctor, they are against that policy of shipping the stuff across the country at all?—A. They have no choice. It is not a matter of choice they have no place to send it to.

Q. And they have established no such place?—A. No, but they are. I understand they are in the midst of it now.

Q. And as the evidence is, they have had nine outbreaks of this same disease?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, doctor, you say you have had requests in answer to the member for Melfort—samples sent in, I believe you said, 1,200 samples from provincial administrations to be tested in your plant?—A. Yes, approximately.

Q. In connection with this matter did you receive at all any sample or any request from the provincial government of Saskatchewan to have a test made?—A. With vesicular stomatitis?

Q. Yes.—A. No, from no government.

Q. You have also stated clearly that the matter of the tests out there was a matter for the field men themselves to conduct—A. Yes to determine.

Q. And you are not attempting to criticize the field men out in the field?—A. Oh, no.

Q. You have been with the department how long, doctor?—A. Thirty-seven years.

Q. You remember there was some conflict, we might say, or dispute in the House about twenty years ago when Mr. Weir was minister as to whether they should divide the department or keep it together?—A. I do not follow the matters in the House very closely so that I would not know.

Q. You do not remember that dispute between the late Mr. Motherwell and Mr. Weir?—A. No, I do not.

Q. In any event, your department is separate from the other?—A. Yes.

Q. And how many diseases of cattle are there, doctor, roughly?—A. I would not even hazard a guess.

Q. How many, roughly—there are a great number?—A. There are a great number.

Q. And how many are there akin to these diseases that have been mentioned here?—A. We know at the present time of only three which are akin, but there may be others that we have not captured.

Q. You mentioned the discovery of a fourth one, somewhat similar to this lately, that is, in California in 1932 there was a new virus discovered there?—A. Yes.

Q. That was a new discovery?—A. Yes.

Q. And the profession yet are not certain that there won't be more discoveries and extensions of these sorts of diseases?—A. I would very much expect that there would.

Q. And in the initial stage of this whole thing the disease was mild, wasn't it, the reports that you read?—A. The reports, yes. I know nothing about it; I have no personal knowledge of it at all.

Q. And, of course, you well know that even doctors make mistakes on diagnoses?—A. Yes.

Q. And I suppose the veterinarians are no more expert than the doctors?—A. No.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Lawyers certainly make them.

Mr. STEWART: Some members of parliament sometimes make mistakes too.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. And there may be quite a vast difference of opinion among veterinarians as to what type of disease this was?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Dr. Mitchell, you said that there had been some records from the past where it was supposed that horses had contracted foot and mouth disease but that today it is generally conceded that horses will not contract foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, would you say that the results of the inoculations on the horses at the Waas farm could be considered as pretty conclusive evidence that the animals from which the material was taken to inoculate those horses did not at that time have foot and mouth disease?—A. No, I would not say that at all.

Q. What would be your main reasons for not saying so?—A. Well, what we have been mentioning right along, and that is that the horse itself might be carrying a latent virus and you are only activating that virus.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. The latent virus of foot and mouth disease?—A. No, of stomatitis.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask Dr. Mitchell a question in connection with Willi Bruntjen, this immigrant. My question as a layman is whether those findings would prove that this man was definitely not a carrier or a carrier

and the idea I had was that your finding was that the fact there was no virus on his person or clothes did not prove conclusively that he was not a carrier of it?—A. All it proved was that about four months after he had been exposed to virus in Germany he did not have it in Canada, but he was out here seventeen days after his exposure in Germany so it did not prove anything.

Q. Is it possible that he might have been the carrier in this country?—A. Oh, yes.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. You mentioned a moment ago that in the United States they had no place to send specimens to and that consequently it had to be done on the farm. Well now, it is true that the United States is one of the countries probably the most concerned with this foot and mouth disease of any country in the world. How do you explain that in a country like the United States they have not got a laboratory to make such tests?—A. Well, that is a question you will have to ask the Americans; I don't know. The only thing that I can offer is that they threw their money into the pot in Canada when we were building up the virus laboratory during the last war and when they went back across the border they had no laboratory; we had the laboratory but not their men.

Q. You mean to say they made a contribution to the Canadian lab?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. In what form did they make contribution to our lab?—A. American dollars.

Q. They contributed?—A. Yes.

Q. Could you elaborate on that? That is a very interesting point. I wonder if you could elaborate at this point, on the fact that the Americans collaborated with the Canadian government in establishing the lab?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am not certain of my ground, but I would just like to suggest that there may be international reasons why they should. I think probably that is correct and if so I would hope that the question as it is asked be not pressed; but might I ask this question and I think it is what Mr. Jutras has in his mind?

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. Before the Americans subscribed to the setting up of these tests at our plant in Hull, did they have a plant of their own for the years before the war?
A. No.

Q. And why didn't they have? Have you any idea why they did not?—A. I think one reason was that virus laboratories had not been developed at that time. Up until the commencement of the last war virus work was attempted usually in very crude laboratories and bacteriological laboratories, but immediately before and during the war there was developed a new type of laboratory which was safe and in which work could be done. It could be situated any place. For instance, Purbright is right down in the dairy district.

Q. Isn't it true that they objected up to that time on the ground that it was not safe?—A. Yes.

Q. Isn't it true that they did not think it was safe and I think you will agree until tests were made during the war probably it was not?—A. Yes.

Q. Without referring to foot and mouth disease at all in particular because, as I suggest, there are international reasons for not doing so, during the war there were certain places set aside, one of them being an island in the St. Lawrence and probably the same thing was true of our Hull plant and

a few other places, where all these particular tests were carried on in order to prevent the possible spreading of the disease? Now, I would assume that the arrangements which were entered into between Canada and the United States in making use of our plants was an international arrangement and the arrangements in regard to it were kept pretty secret.

Mr. STEWART: Will you answer that so it will be on record?

The WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I think Mr. Jutras is right in suggesting that prior to that time the Americans did hold the same position as we held in Canada, that there was some risk in sending this virus around.

Mr. JUTRAS: I might say that the only reason I asked the question was that I was given to understand that for a long while none of the states in the union wanted to have a lab in their own state and that was one of the difficulties why they could not get around to building one. Apparently now there is some understanding that they will use the island which will not affect any one state and in this way get a lab.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. May I ask one other question which you can answer or not as you wish? Have they ever sent any specimens to our lab?—A. No.

By Mr. MacKenzie:

Q. I would like to get this point clarified. Both stomatitis and foot and mouth disease are very contagious diseases, both contagious and infectious, and when a herd gets it, it naturally would go right through the herd. If I understood you correctly, the Waas herd was inoculated with this virus and some of them reacted and some of them did not. I cannot quite understand that.—A. Only a very small proportion did not—seven, and one was a calf that had not been born, so it had no right to react.

Q. But how do you account for the other six?—A. Well, it is very rare that all animals are infected. Usually some escape.

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. Might I ask one further question with regard to it? Was the test carried far enough to indicate whether or not those particular six animals had any diseases before?—A. Vesicular stomatitis, for instance?

Q. Any disease at all. Were these six animals in the herd animals that never had been sick with stomatitis or foot and mouth disease or anything else, or were they animals that had been sick?—A. As far as the tests revealed, there was no evidence of any illness at all.

Q. As far as the test goes, but there is a record. I understood that all the animals in Waas' herd were sick, the 36 of them. If that is wrong, then perhaps the record will show it. If they were all sick then the fact is that six animals which were sick before took foot and mouth disease, which would indicate that as far as those six animals were concerned they did not have foot and mouth disease before?—A. No, it does not indicate that. They were not tested until, I think, around four months after the infection, and it is a well known fact that the resistance washes out very quickly. In fact, it is only considered that three or four months is the period of resistance so those might be just waning out at that time.

Q. Well, I would suggest then from that, or you did suggest in your evidence that probably if you had been home there might have been a little different decision made at the beginning and would that be the reason when you get along to a certain point you are not proving very much of anything after you get two or three months away from an infection?—A. So far as those are concerned you are proving something.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I think in fairness the minister is trying to bring out the fact that six of these cattle did not react, which proved that they had had it before, but I think Dr. Mitchell did answer the question I was going to bring up, that after three months this immunity brought on by the disease previously could have disappeared, is that not correct?—A. Yes.

Q. It has been known that after a period of three months the immunity acquired by the previous disease could have disappeared and that they could have the disease again—after a period of three months?—A. Well, that is a well known fact, that the immunity is not too long lived in foot and mouth disease.

By Mr. MacKenzie:

Q. How long would you say ordinarily?—A. It starts to wane in three or four months. That accounts, of course, for the so-called relapses.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Dr. Mitchell, there is one question I would like to ask. On some of these farms these were dairy herds and when they got sick the milk production dropped off but after a few days the milk production came right up. Would that indicate any foot and mouth disease—it leaves permanent disability, doesn't it, usually in a herd—usually the milk production does not come up and it always leaves some scars or deformities in a herd, but when this herd got over the disease they came back on full production? What would that indicate to you? Did that indicate foot and mouth disease in the field to you?—A. That would indicate a very slight infection, I should think, a very light infection, because it is well known that light infections of foot and mouth disease does not disturb the production very long.

Q. They go right back again?—A. Yes.

Q. And leave no after effects in the herd?—A. Very few.

Q. But they would have some?—A. Not always, no.

Q. It could go through a herd and leave no after effects at all?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Mr. Chairman, when a carrier contracts a foot and mouth disease and then recovers, is there serious danger that other animals can get foot and mouth disease from that animal or is there a lapse of a certain number of months or years when there would be no danger of other animals getting the disease?—A. I am not quite sure I understand your question. I think you mean is it of permanent character?

Q. Yes. In other words is foot and mouth disease really incurable?—A. No, but very often there will be the odd animal in a herd which harbours the virus—very often around the hoof where the coronary band has been disturbed. It will harbour the virus a very long time and that seems to be a source of infection. Ordinarily as soon as the neutralization by the antibodies takes place it disappears except in the bone marrow.

Q. How long would it remain in the bone marrow?—A. Well, a matter of probably two or three weeks while the animal is alive, and a matter of a year if the animal is dead.

Q. Then, after a period of time the animal would be completely recovered from the effects of foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I would like to ask Dr. Mitchell what the 1,200 samples that his lab received from the provincial government consisted of mainly? What were the

samples? What were the provincial governments trying to find out usually, or most frequently, by sending in such samples?—A. I think the majority of samples were samples for typing—or for infectious bronchitis or Newcastle disease in chickens.

Q. Was there any substantial number or proportion of the samples for diseases that you ordinarily understand are covered and looked after by the Federal Health of Animals division?—A. No, I cannot recall many.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Yes. I would like to ask Dr. Mitchell this. At the beginning of this discussion in the House of Commons on March 3, considerable was made of the fact that it took so long, that so long a period was necessary to make a diagnosis of this particular disease. In your statement earlier I believe I understood you to say that the serum which you cabled for on the 12th or 14th of February arrived from Britain before the samples arrived from Regina?—A. No, before the infection had come up in the animals.

Q. Before the infection had come up in the animals?—A. It arrived, as a matter of fact, on the fourth day.

Q. Having been sent over from Great Britain? Now, Dr. Mitchell, it was stated also in the House of Commons that it was necessary to have this serum before diagnosis could be made? Is that true or not?—A. Well, we require the serum for a precise diagnosis.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. We require the serum for a precise diagnosis but we had the serum by the time we could do anything with it.

Q. You did serological tests along with clinical tests?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it absolutely necessary to have the serum to diagnose foot and mouth disease?—A. It is certainly preferable.

Q. To type it?—A. Not only to type it but you do not make mistakes when you have it.

Q. That is more proof that field diagnosis is not a satisfactory way?—A. I prefer it of course, being a laboratory man, to be confirmed by the serum.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Do any of the dominion veterinarians working in the packing plant normally send you samples from various infections or diseases which they suspect in animals which are passing through the plant?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you receive any samples from any of the inspectors in the Regina area during this outbreak at all regarding anything which they found in the plants?—A. No, I cannot recall any specimens. I am quite sure we did not.

Q. How often is it customary, or perhaps this is not a very intelligent question—I do not know—but do you normally receive very many inquiries from these inspectors?—A. No, not normally. It is usually when they are concerned to know whether a thing is a new growth, a tumour—or tuberculosis or something of that kind that has to do with condemnation.

Q. You would expect that when an inspector examined carcasses and found several which had areas of skin and mucous membrane sloughing from the tongue that he would normally make some inquiries and send some samples to find out what was the matter?—A. I cannot answer that question because we would just test it if it arrived. I do not know about the man sending it.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. There was one question. Mr. Charlton was speaking about field tests not being as good as tests in Hull. I am still curious about the United States. They must be using a lot of tests, and they must have fears or we will

say reports that they have foot and mouth disease in certain parts of the country. Do they not use field tests? Would they not use what in their opinion was the best method?—A. I cannot speak for the United States.

Q. You must know how they do it?—A. I do not at all, but I do know that occasionally they send specimens to England. I would assume they conduct field tests and when a laboratory test is carried out they send to England where the greatest foot and mouth disease laboratory in the world is located,—at which this work has been specially developed. However, I do not know; I have no first hand knowledge.

Q. You think in each case they send specimens to England or they use field tests?

Mr. STEWART: He does not know.

The WITNESS: I really do not know at all.

Mr. BRYCE: In sending these samples would they use the method as prescribed by the Department of Agriculture here?

The WITNESS: I would not know that either.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of Dr. Mitchell?

Mr. ROSS: I have a question but I am not sure that this is the proper gentleman to ask. Following up the tests that were made would you have anything to do with the recommending of proper steps to be taken either with respect to persons or materials being brought into this country—when they might be a means of carrying the virus? Do you have any knowledge of that kind of thing?

The WITNESS: No.

Mr. ROSS: You would not be directly responsible for that.

Mr. MACKENZIE: There is something I cannot get quite clear in my mind. If you take an animal with such a contagious disease as foot and mouth disease, it can build up its own immunity to destroy that disease but yet take the same disease again in three months?

The WITNESS: That has puzzled a lot of us.

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. There is one thing along the same line that I would like to know for my own information and I presume that others of the committee would like to know. I would like to get it clear, following up what you have said—as I am afraid I have been saying some things that are not exactly correct.

I have always been of the impression that the reason the disease is considered so difficult to handle is that an animal that once takes the disease is never clear of it as a rule. There may be a few exceptions but not many. Then, I have noted in connection with this epidemic—and I did not realize it before—that not many animals have died. There have been I think a few calves—but a very few animals that have died. Probably that is due to the fact that we slaughtered them and if we had left them alone they may have died naturally. However, I take it from what you have said now that the disease can disappear entirely inside of a very few weeks.

Now, why is this disease such a dangerous disease if no animals die from it readily? It is not like typhoid fever in people, for example; it does not kill the animals right away.

Then, you suggest to us now that the disease does not stay with the animals very long and that they can come back and produce their full flow of milk again; and that you can come back and feed them and they can react just as readily to that feed as they did before—and produce beef as readily as they did before.

If I am correct in that—and if I am not correct I would like to know—I wonder whether you would mind telling us why this disease is considered such a virulent disease, and why we must slaughter all animals immediately that they take the disease?—A. Well, I think you misunderstood the answer to the question. I was asked the question in the case of a very mild infection would they or might they come back quickly. The fact is that after these infections get going they become very severe and very invasive. The longer they get going the more invasive they are. It is quite true, that the death rate in animals is very low—generally it is in the younger stock—but the damage which is done after the infection is well established in a country is that it sweeps through, cuts into production, and you have cripples and boarders on your hands—matters like that.

The carrier problem is not one of animals but of herds. In a herd of 38 animals you might have one with a distorted hoof, but that one would be sufficient to carry the infection all around the country. It is a herd problem rather than a single animal problem.

Q. Yes, but if most of them get better, and if there is only one say out of a herd that gets it seriously enough to become a carrier, and if the other animals can go on and never take it again, then why is it considered such a virulent disease?—A. It is a virulent disease after it gets going, but very often in these mild outbreaks spoken of, of course it is not.

Q. Is it not true when the disease is established, and everybody is agreed that it is there in a virulent type, that it does create a condition in which cows do not milk well?—A. Oh, certainly.

Q. And it creates a condition in which cattle do not react to feed, and those conditions are permanent?—A. Yes, that is quite true.

Q. The impression I got from the answers a while ago was that these animals can get entirely clear of it and they might never react to it again. I would say then, if they actually have had what everybody understands to be a virulent type of foot and mouth disease, that just does not happen?—A. There may be types of infection in the early stages that are relatively mild; but the question that was posed was whether they may return to normal in cases of mild infection. The answer is yes, but these mild infections are only the primary ones in an outbreak. It picks up virulence as it goes along and then it does all this damage we are so afraid of. I am not minimizing the danger one bit; because I do think it is a tremendously important problem—but the real effects of it are seen after the first few herds have been invaded.

Q. But the question that was asked, and I just want to get your attitude because you are a specialist on this kind of thing, contained the suggestion as I understood it that there was some reason why the officials might have thought it was not foot and mouth disease but that it was stomatitis. When they examined these herds they followed through the reactions to treatment and, at the end of six days or eight days the herd was entirely free of the disease. They watched them for another two months and still none of them developed the disease. Now, I presume what you are saying is that if it was foot and mouth disease at all it must have been a very mild case before that could happen. If it was the virulent type of foot and mouth disease that we are all afraid of then, at some stage during that period, it would have been established that they were not coming back on to milk and they were not reacting to feed, and so on—and that does not appear to have been the case unless there is some evidence we have not had.

Mr. ARGUE: I think the right honourable minister's question as to the economic results of this disease are very important. I know from talking to people in the infected area that amongst some there is quite a widespread feeling about the steps of slaughtering herds of cattle. They question whether

it is not too severe. I think getting that information is very important to counteract the very natural feeling amongst the people who find their herds slaughtered or who feel they are in danger of having their herds slaughtered.

I wonder, Dr. Mitchell, if you could give us some idea of the percentage of economic loss in our cattle or to the cattle industry of any country where foot and mouth disease becomes widespread? What is the economic loss—considering the loss of flesh, loss of milk, and the percentage of cattle that die from the disease?

The WITNESS: I think that question should be directed to a member of the Health of Animals division. They are closer in touch with disease conditions in the field than I am—much closer, and therefore they should answer.

Mr. ARGUE: It would be a substantial percentage? It would be a terrific loss to any nation, and therefore they know it is one of the reasons—

Mr. STEWART: Well, you are giving the evidence but he says that you had better ask another evidence.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I just want to get an answer on that to allay the fears and the beliefs of people in the country who I think, personally, are to a large extent mistaken. Very well, I will ask the witness this.

You feel that policy followed of slaughtering cattle where the infection has been contacted, is a policy which is in the interests of the livestock industry of Canada?—A. Yes, emphatically.

Q. What countries in the world that have foot and mouth disease follow the practice we are following now in Canada, or a practice somewhat similar—slaughtering the affected herd and the contacts of herds? It is a common practice in the western countries?—A. Yes.

By Mr. MacKenzie:

Q. If I understood this, and I read it at least, in central Europe they do not destroy herds, they live with the disease?—A. They cannot do anything else. The infection is so prevalent that they cannot do anything else.

Q. But it has not wiped the cattle herds out?—A. It does not wipe them out but it is greatly feared all the same. They live on vaccinations.

Mr. ARGUE: What do they do in Britain?

The WITNESS: The same as Canada.

Mr. STEWART: They do not slaughter in Belgium and some of those countries?

The WITNESS: No, they vaccinate.

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. Just one more question. I may have misunderstood Dr. Carlson yesterday but I think I understood him to refer to nine different epidemics in the United States. I also understood him to say that one of those epidemics of foot and mouth disease, after it was diagnosed, turned out not to be foot and mouth disease. Quite a number of livestock were slaughtered and then it turned out not to be foot and mouth disease. Is that correct?—A. That is correct.

Q. I just want to emphasize that once more. Do you know what part of the United States that occurred in?—A. California.

Q. Was that in 1929?—A. 1932, I think.

Q. I think the whole procedure ended in 1932 but it was an epidemic around the beginning of the 1930's.

Naturally, of course, that would have some effect on others who were diagnosing this disease from time to time—they would be a little more careful about calling it foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. After this last epidemic they had in the States— —A. Yes.

Q. Has there been any stomatitis in the States recently?—A. Not that I know of. There may be cases but I would not know. It is a local disease.

Q. Someone else may be able to answer the question.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. To follow that up, they did not have a laboratory in the United States, as you have stated, at which they could have made a correct diagnosis at the time of the outbreak in the United States—in 1930?—A. No, they had no virus laboratory and out of that came the discovery of the virus I mentioned this morning—animal vesicular exanthema.

In the clinical picture in pigs it shows the same as foot and mouth disease, and it was taken at face value. Of course, precision methods had not been developed at that time. It is quite different now.

Q. That is the point I wanted to bring out. You have a laboratory in Canada which would make it impossible for a condition such as occurred in the United States in the 1930's to happen. Is that correct? Using your laboratory in Hull and the facilities you have now, it would be practically impossible to make the same mistake that was made in the 1930's with the outbreak in the United States?—A. I would expect so, but we all make mistakes, of course.

MR. STEWART: When did they establish the laboratory in England?

THE WITNESS: About 1927.

MR. STEWART: So they had it in England and the States could have sent material over there.

By Mr. Cory:

Q. Might I ask Dr. Mitchell this. In a country like ours where we have had no experience with foot and mouth disease, would you not expect that an outbreak would be much more violent than the one we have experienced?—A. That depends entirely on the strain.

Q. And in the case of those countries where they do not slaughter them and where the animals make recovery, are they more or less susceptible—those which make the recovery? Are they able to build up more immunity than those which have never been exposed to the disease?—A. It does not seem to make any difference.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Does not a high percentage of animals in European countries die? If they do not have a mild form but a good dose, they go off their feed and go down and just die?—A. Oh, yes. It varies from one outbreak to another.

Q. But a high percentage dies?—A. Yes. It varies from one outbreak to another.

Q. Which makes it a really bad disease?—A. Yes.

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: Have we finished with Dr. Mitchell?

Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest that probably we should meet again this afternoon at four o'clock when Dr. Hall will be with us.

The committee adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Before calling on the next witness I have one or two announcements to make. A question was asked by Mr. Harkness at one of the meetings. The question reads as follows:

Question: A. What was the disposal of the 207 cattle, 145 sheep and 50 swine in the Burns' feed lot at the time of quarantine?

B. Following the lifting of the quarantine on January 17 what cattle, sheep and swine went into the Burns' yard and what disposition was made of those animals?

Answer to A and B:

On December 28 the Burns' feed lot, holding at that time 207 cattle, 145 sheep and 50 swine, was quarantined. Livestock continued to flow through the holding pens and into the plant. The general quarantine, put into effect on February 18, applied to feed lot, stock pens and the plant generally.

Of the animals in the feed lot at the time of the quarantine on December 28 none was shipped out alive. A number, after inspection by Health of Animals meat inspectors, were slaughtered for meat. This meat was distributed in the ordinary course of business; some may have been destroyed with the meat condemned after the quarantine of February 18. It is possible that some animals which had been in the feed lot on December 28 remained there and were among the 74 cattle, 11 sheep and 57 lambs slaughtered and buried on February 29. The Department of Agriculture records deal with the numbers of animals entering the plant, the quantities of meat shipped out in interprovincial trade, and outward movements of cattle. Records taken by the Department do not identify and follow to its destination each individual carcass or portion of carcass; it is not therefore possible to indicate what proportion of the meat from the animals in question was shipped out and what was destroyed. Similarly, records are not maintained of movements of animals in and out of the feed lot as such; after the feed lot quarantine was lifted on January 17 there was some movement from feed lot to stock pens or directly into the plant.

The following are the live animals shipped to the Burns' establishment between December 28, 1951, and February 17, 1952:

LIVESTOCK ARRIVALS AT BURNS' PLANT, REGINA

Cattle and Calves			Direct	From Local Yards	From Other Yards	Total
Week ending—						
January	19	103	59	16	178
"	26	63	25	17	105
February	2	144	106	24	274
"	9	197	78	3	278
"	16	52	16	68
"	23	5	3	8
			<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
			564	268	79	911

Sheep and Hogs		Sheep	Hogs
Week ending—			
January	19	15	575
"	26	7	480
February	2	7	880
"	9	7	925
"	16	18	432
"	23	125
		<hr/> 54	<hr/> 3,417

In the period December 28-January 17 none of these animals entered the feed lot, which was under quarantine; nor did any animals enter the feed lot after January 17 and prior to the general quarantine. Of the animals received by Burns during the entire period December 29-February 17, inclusive, the following animals were shipped out alive: 2 calves on January 22, and 2 steers on February 12; these 4 animals went to herds which were ultimately condemned and slaughtered, as contact herds.

Information regarding shipments of meat from the Burns' plant out of Saskatchewan during the period in question has already been placed on the records. The Department of Agriculture does not maintain record of shipments within the province of origin.

These answers will be handed around to each member of the committee.

There was also another question which was asked this time by Mr. Diefenbaker in connection with the distribution of semen from government bulls at Regina and the answer is as follows:

Between November 1st and January 24th, 36 herds of cattle received artificial insemination service. Of this number 33 herds were in the Moose Jaw area, one at Swift Current and one at Sintaluta. All of these herds have been inspected by Health of Animals officials and found healthy.

One herd in the Regina area from which a cow was bred artificially was later slaughtered.

Two cows from the Regina area were bred in the bull barn at Regina by natural means and the herds involved subsequently slaughtered.

And that advice will be handed around to each member.

Yesterday a question was raised at the meeting as to the inspector in the field reporting to the minister, and I have this statement from Mr. Varcoe, which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
CANADA

OTTAWA 4, May 6, 1952.

Dear Sir:

163716

I understand that you wish to be advised as to whether an inspector who has made a declaration under section 24 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and who is required under section 25 of that Act to send a copy thereof to the minister is required to forward the copy directly to the Minister of Agriculture or whether he complies with the requirements of the section if he forwards the copy for transmission to the minister through the usual departmental channels.

I am of opinion that an inspector complies with the requirements of section 25 if he forwards a copy of his declaration to the minister in such manner as the minister may prescribe. In the absence of any specific direction, in my opinion, it is implicit and must be taken to have been intended by Parliament that the copy of the declaration should be forwarded to the minister through the usual departmental channels in which information is conveyed to the minister. It is now settled by judicial authority that a reference to a minister in such a provision as section 25 is to be interpreted as enacted by Parliament with the knowledge that the minister is the head of a department and acts through his departmental organization. Action required to be taken pursuant to such a provision is to be taken in the usual manner in which such action is taken in such an organization.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) F. P. VARCOE

Deputy Attorney General of Canada.

The Deputy Minister,
Department of Agriculture,
Ottawa 4, Ont.

We have with us this afternoon Dr. Orlan Hall, assistant veterinary director-general.

Mr. ROSS: Before you proceed, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if it would not be advisable to read the answers to the questions you quoted into the record.

The CHAIRMAN: These answers are all to be printed into the record and the reporter has copies of them.

Mr. BROWNE: I wonder if anyone has made up a map showing the location of each outbreak, and the number and date on which the outbreak occurred? I think it would be very instructive to everyone concerned.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): I think it would be a very proper thing if the province of Saskatchewan be shown on the map and the limits of this area be properly delineated on that map of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been given to understand that Dr. Wells might be able to do that when he comes before us. Are there any further questions before we call on our next witness, Dr. Hall?

Dr. Orlan Hall, Assistant Veterinary Director-General of Canada, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and hon. gentlemen: I have had 40 years experience with the Health of Animals division, and practically all of that time was spent in the field. I mean, the time was spent in connection with field work. My headquarters have been at Ottawa and I have remained here during that period. I started my career in the service at the magnificent salary of \$75 a month.

I have served as veterinary inspector. I have done the travelling jobs. I have served as supervisor of bovine tuberculosis eradication, chief veterinary inspector and as assistant veterinary director-general.

During that period I have served under a number of veterinary director-generals; first, Rutherford; then Torrance; then Hilton; then Cameron; then Barker; and now Dr. Childs. At the same time I served under a number of deputies, O'Halloran; Grisdale, Barton, and now Dr. Taggart. And during that time you will realize there were a number of ministers in charge of the department.

I should like for just a moment to say something about the Health of Animals division and the purpose for which it was established. In the first place, that division was established for the purpose of preventing the introduction of serious livestock diseases which could, if introduced, prove detrimental to our livestock industry. That, in the first instance, is why the division was established as a branch at that time; and from then on it became apparent that we had to deal with the contagious diseases which we already had in the country.

So that there may be no misunderstanding, the division has accomplished many things. First of all, I would like to refer to the disease dourine among horses in Canada. That disease was with us, I believe, previous to 1904 or 1905, but was eradicated in 1920-21.

Mr. SINNOTT: What was the name of that disease again, please?

The WITNESS: Dourine; and again we were dealing with glanders in horses in 1904-05, and we cleaned up that disease by 1938-39. I might say that hog cholera has not been with us since 1946-47, with the exception of 2 herds of hogs in Newfoundland, which became infected and were dealt with in the fiscal year 1951-52.

We have also eradicated sheep scab from this country which was of economic importance to the sheep industry. Among other things I might mention mange in cattle which we have not completely eradicated; but we

do keep it under control, and the same applies to horses. This is an accomplishment of which I think the department may be well proud. I said the purpose of the division in the first instance was to prevent the introduction into this country of serious animal diseases which could if introduced prove of economic importance to the livestock industry, and in carrying out, preventive measures it was necessary to regulate and interfere in many ways with normal trade between Canada and other countries, because we had either to prohibit, regulate, or supervise many things coming into this country which could carry serious diseases. I mention hides, skins, hoofs, horns, as well as merchandise packed in fodder and many other things. We have through appropriate measures been successful in keeping the more serious diseases out of this country during the years, but unfortunately foot and mouth disease was introduced into this country apparently in November last. I think that will give you a little background of what has gone on over the year.

The CHAIRMAN: Does anybody wish to ask any questions?

Mr. MURRAY: (Cariboo): Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murray.

By Mr. Murray:

Q. This may be beyond the limits of Saskatchewan, but other countries have been mentioned here, such as Central Europe, Western Europe, the United States, Mexico, and so forth. Is there not a large population of cattle in Asia, or in India, for instance? I wonder if you have any estimate of the number of cattle there are in India or Pakistan?—A. Well, I have no official figures at the moment, but we do know that over the entire country known as India, the cattle population runs very very high. Of course, I am not saying anything about the quality.

Q. Are those herds subject to these diseases, such as foot and mouth disease?—A. Well, they have about everything there.

Q. Of course, in India, it is regarded as illegal to slaughter animals of any kind in certain parts, is it not? and cows in India are regarded as being sacred, are they not?—A. I believe so.

Q. They are not subject to any health regulations there, I take it?—A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. I ask this in view of the fact that there is considerable traffic from Asia to western Canada by aeroplane and otherwise. It is remote, but nevertheless there is an exchange of commodities such as wool, hides, carpets, jute. Would there be any likelihood of contamination from any Asiatic country?—A. You mention hides for one thing. Green salted hides, yes. Hard dried hides we allow in.

If there are any green salted hides coming into this country from India those hides are met at the port of entry by one of our men who takes charge and sees that they are placed in sealed and placarded cars going to a tannery which we have approved and where the hides can be handled under restriction. So we know, if there should be any organisms or any virus of foot and mouth disease or rinderpest, we have taken care of it at that point.

So far as rugs are concerned, and jute, we do not look upon them as a source of danger at all. No danger at all, practically.

You are talking about a carpet or a rug from India that you would put on the floor? Is that correct?

Q. Well, it would be wool?—A. Yes, it is a manufactured rug and it goes on your floor. I do not think there is any danger there at all.

Q. Is there any exchange of information as between commonwealth countries with respect to the health of animals?—A. Yes, there is.

Q. Continuously?—A. Certainly. We get reports continually from Australia, New Zealand, South Africa—

Q. They are all cattle countries are they not?—A. Oh yes. Great Britain, Ireland—we have a way, through our Department of Trade and Commerce and other channels as well. We get as many reports as we possibly can on every country in the world—to keep posted as to what is going on in those countries.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart?

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Dr. Hall, in connection with this present epidemic of foot and mouth disease, can you tell the committee what inspections have been made by the veterinary inspectors of the department to prevent any possible spread of this disease?—A. In addition to the normal inspections at all meat packing plants, inspectors of this division from February 18 to May 1, 1952, have turned in approximately 25,000 reports. To be exact the number is 24,824. This is based on the number of reports on file.

You will note from the reports already tabled that a great many of them cover more than one premises—that is two visits to a premises. In addition to those inspections, since regulations were proposed dealing with immigrants coming from foreign countries, over 4,000 inspections have been made by an augmented staff at the sea coast.

Q. You mention upwards of 25,000 inspections. Can you tell me how many animals this would cover?—A. Well, for the same period—February 18 to May 1, 1952, that covers 874,326 animals.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is that for Canada?

The WITNESS: For Canada.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Now, doctor, can you tell me how many outbreaks of foot and mouth disease there have been in the United States of America?—A. Well, sir, there have been nine since 1880 or since the establishment of the United States bureau of animal industry.

Q. Can you give me the years?—A. 1880, 1884, 1902, 1908, 1914, 1924, 1925, 1929, and 1932.

Q. I gather from the remarks of the witness that the U.S.A. have a number of top authorities on foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes, that is correct; they have.

Q. And you know of those authorities?—A. Yes.

Q. Yes, I understand from the evidence of Dr. Carlson that on at least one occasion they took five months to diagnose the disease. Is that correct?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. WRIGHT: In what year was that?

The WITNESS: 1932.

Mr. HARKNESS: Is it correct that on another occasion they made an incorrect diagnosis and only noticed the error after having slaughtered 18,000 hogs and 40 cattle?

The WITNESS: I understand so.

Mr. HARKNESS: Would it not save time to file the answers to those questions?

Mr. ROSS: If you filed it in the record it would save time.

Mr. STEWART: There are two or three of you asking questions all at once but if you will wait until I have finished and make note of your questions, I would have no objection to you asking.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Is it correct that on another occasion they made an incorrect diagnosis and only noticed the error after slaughtering 18,000 hogs and 40 head of cattle?—A. I believe that is correct.

Q. Was this after they had previous outbreaks in which they would have gained experience?—A. Yes, in 1932—and they have had outbreaks since 1880.

Mr. BROWNE: On a point of order, is this not hearsay evidence that Dr. Hall is giving—as to reports of what has happened in the United States? Does he know that of his own knowledge? I suggest the records ought to be produced or the evidence not given otherwise.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. BROWNE: I submit that in any legal proceedings that would have to be done—the documents themselves produced.

Mr. STEWART: I would suggest that some of your members here have given evidence from their own questions repeatedly—such as the doctor—

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Stewart is a lawyer and he knows that what I am saying is correct.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. This is not a legal court. These records you are referring to are records from the American government, available to anybody in this room?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Anybody can check on those records if he wants to deny the accuracy of your statements?—A. So far as I am aware.

Q. Are there any more objections?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. What action has been taken by the Health of Animals division or the Department of Agriculture in the last five or ten years to tighten existing regulations with respect to contagious diseases in the Dominion of Canada?—A. In the past ten years there have been 36 orders in council and 60 ministerial orders. Those have been passed relating to changes in the Animals Contagious Diseases and the Meat and Canned Foods Act. Those orders, I think in most instances, are all published in the annual reports of the veterinary director general.

Q. And those are available to the members?—A. Those are available to anyone.

Q. Now, in connection with this present outbreak in Saskatchewan can you tell us approximately how many animals have been destroyed in Canada since the outbreak of this foot and mouth disease in December of 1951?—A. Now are you referring to all diseases or foot and mouth disease alone?—

Q. Foot and mouth disease—animals destroyed for that?—A. Well, to March 31st there were 1,293 animals slaughtered for foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan, and up until yesterday that number had increased to 1,734.

Q. A total of 1,734 have been destroyed to date in this epidemic?—A. Up until yesterday.

Q. 1,734?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, you have had occasion in your department to destroy animals in connection with other diseases that have not been featured such as this disease has been featured in this committee. Other animals have been destroyed, as I understand it—for instance cattle in connection with tuberculosis. How many animals have been destroyed in your department in connection with tuber-

culosis?—A. Well, from the fiscal year 1947-48, to the end of 1951-52 there were 103,821 head of cattle slaughtered under our tuberculosis eradication policies.

Q. In the Dominion of Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. As against 1,734.

Mr. BROWN: There is no comparison in the number of years. This is absurd.

Mr. STEWART: You can ask the witness later.

My friend who is out for political capital in this thing does not enjoy the answers that he is getting.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Now, the next question I want to ask you is this. There were also cattle destroyed in connection with other diseases?—A. Outside of foot and mouth disease—we slaughtered cattle for tuberculosis, foot and mouth disease, and we slaughtered one herd for trypanosomiasis.

Q. Now, can you tell the committee how many animals were slaughtered in say Great Britain in the last five years for foot and mouth disease?—A. Their records would indicate that in 1951 there were 12,875. In 1950, 2,140; in 1949, 3,034; in 1948, 1,592; 1947, 10,921.

Q. Would you tell the committee, doctor, how many were slaughtered in the U.S.A. in the different years?—A. We cannot give you figures for the whole nine outbreaks but, excluding 1880 and 1884 the figures are: 1902, 4,712; 1908, 3,636; 1914, 172,000; 1924, 131,973; 1925, 31,918; 1929, 3,591; 1932, 18,817.

Q. And I understand in one of those outbreaks alone the foot and mouth disease in the United States, with all their precautions and all their efficient help, spread into 22 states of the union?—A. In the 1914 outbreak it spread into 22 states. It was present in the state of Michigan for three months before it was diagnosed.

Q. So that the loss so far in this present epidemic in Canada we might say is almost a mere drop in the bucket compared with the losses in these other countries?—A. In so far as the slaughter of livestock is concerned.

Q. And I think you agree with the statement of the previous witness that in England they have very efficient men there—as well as in the United States—A. That is correct.

Q. In England they have very efficient men in charge of preventing this very thing happening?—A. Yes, the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries maintains what we believe to be an excellent staff.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Argue.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I would like to ask Dr. Hall which outbreak it was in the United States that the diagnosis of foot and mouth disease was delayed for a period of five months?—A. The five months?

Q. Yes?—A. I am afraid, sir, I cannot answer that question. I do not know the five months one.

Q. Do you not say there was one outbreak that was delayed for a period of five months?—A. Three months.

Q. Oh very well. What was the date of the one in the United States that was delayed for three months?—A. That was in 1914.

Q. A period almost comparable to the period in Canada before this outbreak—from the time of the first outbreak in December till the time of the final diagnosis was nearly three months. Is that correct?—A. Yes, I would say so.

Q. Were you here this morning when Dr. Mitchell was giving his evidence?—A. I was.

Q. Do you agree with the evidence placed on the record this morning, that because we have a laboratory at Hull we were in a much better position to make a correct diagnosis than we had been in before that laboratory was established?

—A. Yes, I agree with that.

Q. Would you say we were in a better position to make a better diagnosis of foot and mouth disease than were the Americans in 1914, because they had no lab?—A. Well, in 1914 we were in no better position than they were.

Q. But today we are in a much better position than they were then?—A. I would say so.

Q. So the comparison of 1952 in Canada as compared with the 1914 experience in the United States is not at all comparable.

Mr. STEWART: Well, you are giving evidence.

Mr. ARGUE: You are not following good court procedure yourself, I think. Any evidence I give is my own. There is nothing that has been rehearsed at any time. Nothing that I went to anyone else for to draft. These are my own questions. They might not be quite as good as those given by Mr. Stewart, but I am the sole author of them.

Mr. STEWART: Can we rely on that?

By Mr. Argue:

Q. As deputy veterinary general, do you work in the same office as the veterinary director general?—A. Yes, in the Confederation Building.

Q. Could you tell me what the internal procedure followed has been after an inspector in the field makes an investigation of an infectious disease, establishes a quarantine and files a report? What is the normal course of that report? Where does it go?—A. That inspector makes his report. He turns it in to the district officer in charge of the province. The district officer makes a record and any comment he makes is then forwarded to Ottawa, to the veterinary director general.

Q. And when the veterinary director general receives the report, what is done with it then?—A. Well, it is recorded in our record room. The report is properly filed and if it is of an extraordinary nature it is passed on down the line.

Q. Passed on to whom down the line?—A. Well, the next man in line to be notified was the director of production service, and then the deputy.

Q. Mr. Young and then the deputy. Do you know whether any of these weekly reports were sent to the Minister of Agriculture?—A. Weekly reports?

Q. I understood there were weekly reports.—A. You are talking now about a report of the inspector who makes a declaration that a farm is infected.

Q. All right. Let us go back to the reports of inspectors made on infected premises. Were any of those reports from December 2, originating in the Regina area, sent to the minister, to your knowledge?—A. I would not be prepared to answer that question at the moment, sir, because I happened to be, from the 27th November to the 14th January I was ill, and away from the office, and in the interval anything that went on during that period was not known to me.

Q. There were some reports, were there, of the kind I have mentioned?—A. I presume so.

Q. After you came back from your illness?—A. Yes, there would be some.

Q. And as far as you know they were not forwarded to Mr. Young or the deputy minister?—A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. This is my evidence now. This seems rather amazing to me. I had asked the question yesterday of the witness about section 25, when an inspector makes such a declaration, and the existence of infectious or contagious diseases

of animals, "he shall with all practicable speed send a copy thereof to the minister". I thought that meant directly to the minister, but according to the opinion of Mr. F. P. Varcoe, Deputy Attorney General, in a submission given to the committee by the chairman today, that does not mean directly to the minister. The first part of it reads as follows:

I understand that you wish to be advised as to whether an inspector who has made a declaration under section 24 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and who is required under section 25 of that Act to send a copy thereof to the minister is required to forward the copy directly to the Minister of Agriculture or whether he complies with the requirements of the section if he forwards the copy for transmission to the minister through the usual departmental channels.

I am of the opinion that an inspector complies with the requirements of section 25 if he forwards a copy of his declaration to the minister in such manner as the minister may prescribe. In the absence of any specific direction, in my opinion, it is implicit and must be taken to have been intended by parliament that the copy of the declaration should be forwarded to the minister through the usual departmental channels in which information is conveyed to the minister.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Now read the next sentence.

Mr. ARGUE: I will:

It is now settled by judicial authority that a reference to a minister in such a provision as section 25 is to be interpreted as enacted by parliament with the knowledge that the minister is the head of a department and acts through his departmental organization. Action required to be taken pursuant to such a provision is to be taken in the usual manner in which such action is taken in such an organization.

Now, all that means to me is that—and that is this man's opinion—if a man in the field, an inspector in the field does not need to, as provided in section 25, send a copy directly himself to the minister, that that copy shall nevertheless go to the minister, through the departmental channels, up through the veterinary director general to the head of the production service branch, to the deputy minister and to the minister.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I might suggest to my hon. friend that if he reads the Acts that set up the different departments of government I think he will find the interpretation placed there is that the deputy minister means the minister.

Mr. ARGUE: All I can go by is the Act that we have before us, with the addition of this interpretation which we will assume to be a good legal interpretation by the Deputy Attorney General of Canada.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDNER: That is exactly what he says in the last two sentences.

Mr. ARGUE: Well, those last two sentences are pretty loose and it is pretty difficult to see just what he does say:

In the absence of any specific direction, in my opinion, it is implicit and must be taken to have been intended by parliament that the copy of the declaration should be forwarded to the minister through the usual departmental channels in which information is conveyed to the minister.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDNER: It is now settled by judicial authority that the deputy minister is the minister, and the final decision on matters of law is a judicial decision.

Mr. ARGUE: Well, that in no way is in conflict with the sentence I read.

Mr. STEWART: On a point of order. I think he is taking an unfair advantage of the witness. If you look up the Interpretation Act you will find that the definition of minister includes deputy minister.

Mr. ARGUE: O.K. If you want to assume it, and I do not assume it, the deputy minister in his evidence said those reports did not reach him until February—

Mr. STEWART: Are you arguing to the committee that we should have the minister read reports received from over 25,000 veterinarian surgeons throughout Canada, that he should really read a thousand reports a day?

Mr. ARGUE: My argument is that the law of the country should be followed, and I say it has not been followed.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It has been followed.

The CHAIRMAN: You have one more minute, Mr. Argue.

Mr. ARGUE: And it is my opinion that if these reports, very important reports on contagious diseases, had gone to the minister personally, this situation would, in all probability, have been cleaned up and taken care of long before this, but because the law was not followed and because those reports did not reach the minister throughout all the time of this disease until February 18 or so, it has led to the mess that we are in.

Mr. STEWART: He says the law was not followed. The law was followed, and my friend does not know the law.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Laing.

Mr. ARGUE: If I do not know the law, I would not go to the member for Yorkton for an interpretation.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. Doctor, how many years have you been with the department?—A. Forty.

Q. And how many years have you been in Ottawa?—A. Forty.

Q. In all of that time have you had any indication of other than complete co-operation between the federal organization here and the provincial organizations? I have in mind the people like Dr. Gunn, the Livestock Commissioner of British Columbia. I take it there is a constant flow of material back and forth, and you compare reports and so on, and the measure of co-operation is good with all the provinces?—A. I would not say that it was bad. Mind you, in carrying out our official duties we do not always agree on matters, but that does not mean that we do not have co-operation.

Q. But there has been, in your experience, on the part of the provincial authorities willingness to do the best they can, as in the case of this outbreak. The co-operation is complete between the federal authorities and the provinces?—A. I do not think that I understand your question, sir. Are you trying—

Q. Let us take the case of any outbreak of a very serious nature, going back across the years, out of your 40 years experience. There has been willingness and a complete desire on the part of the provincial authorities to co-operate?—A. On the whole I would say, yes.

Q. Did you read the evidence of yesterday where a letter was introduced or part of a letter was extracted indicating that in the past that had not been so in the case of one of the provinces?—A. No, I do not recall that.

Mr. WRIGHT: I object to the question. He is making an entire misrepresentation of the statement which I read.

Mr. LAING: Are you speaking to a point of order?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr. LAING: Well, then, address the chair, and let us have the point of order

The letter was not read in full, but the extracted part is in our record still, and I take it it stands, and there was an indication that there had been an argument in past years between the federal authority and one of the provinces in respect of jurisdiction in the case of an outbreak of encephalitis in the case of horses.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is right.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. I wanted to ask Dr. Hall if he had any recollection of that, in the province of Saskatchewan.—A. Well, no. I have no recollection that there was any difficulty at all. I believe that the federal department at that time—in fact, the division at that time—considered that in so far as encephalitis was concerned, that was a matter with which the province could deal.

Q. I didn't know whether in the past experience the Saskatchewan government might have had with the federal government there were instances of that nature or why they should be brought up unless there is difficulty existing today; and, if there is difficulty existing today between the federal government and the Department of Agriculture of Saskatchewan I think we should know that. I am merely trying to find out why the instance was brought up in the light of the only part we heard. There was no suggestion of any difficulty existing between your department and the province of Saskatchewan in the past but that brief example? Why take an example from the past if there is complete co-operation today? Is there complete co-operation today between the federal authority and the Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan?—A. I don't know of any difficulty.

Q. There has been no indication to you at all of any difficulty whatsoever? There has never been any suggestion on the part of the Department of Agriculture of Saskatchewan that you were acting wrongly; or that you were not doing enough about the embargo and so on in Saskatchewan at all?—A. Not that I am aware of. There may have been things like that which I did not know about, but I did not know of any.

Q. Then why did you take that old example of years ago of the difficulty in connection with some encephalitis, why should it have been brought out as an example unless it was indicative of the situation which still exists. Have you any explanation of that? I would like to be assured, and I think the committee wants to know that there is complete co-operation in the localizing of this disease and its eradication, between your department here and the province of Saskatchewan; and, you will be prepared to say that co-operation exists, they are co-operating 100 per cent, are they?—A. In so far as I am concerned, and in so far as I know at the moment; I do not know of anyone not co-operating.

Q. Well that leaves me in an impossible position as far as trying to find an explanation for what happened yesterday goes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Quelch.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Dr. Hall, I wonder if you could outline to me the extent to which you were brought into the picture in regard to the outbreak in the first case of stomatitis and later on of the foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan? Would you outline and explain to the committee how you were brought into the picture?—A. I might say this, sir, that when I returned to the office on the 14th Dr. Stewart, who had been taking my place, drew my attention to the fact that there was some stomatitis in the Regina district.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: What date was that?

The WITNESS: The 14th of January.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Did he think it might be another disease than stomatitis?—A. I do not know that he suggested it was any other disease, but he did ask me if I considered that stomatitis would linger so long and if steps should be taken to make a more definite diagnosis. Well, I talked the matter over with Dr. Childs at that time; Dr. Childs worked in Saskatchewan before coming to Ottawa, said that he was going out again, which he did; in fact I believe he left on that day; then, so far as I was concerned, I did not pay any more particular attention to it at the time. I believe that Dr. Childs was really under the impression that we had the same type of vesicular stomatitis that we had in 1938 and 1939; with which he was familiar and I believe that he was convinced in his own mind that, that is what we had. As I say, he had been out there in 1938-39 and he had seen the condition in January, 1952; I had not. Nothing further developed any more than when he came back from Regina he told me that that was what he thought it was.

Q. What date is that?—A. I am speaking now of after I returned, the 14th of January. He left and went to Regina and he was out there a few days and then returned to Ottawa again. Nothing more was heard of it so far as I am concerned until the 12th of February when, as you know from Dr. Mitchell's evidence here this morning, and also from the evidence of Dr. Carlson; you understand the action that was taken.

Q. On February 12th you received a phone call from Dr. Carlson, did you not?—A. That is correct.

Q. In view of the fact that you knew that Dr. Childs was firmly opposed to specimens being taken, did you endeavour to get in touch with Dr. Childs by phone?—A. It was not a matter of specimens at that time. Dr. Carlson was asking for help, that is what he was asking for.

Q. Did he not stress the fact that the disease might be taking a more serious turn?—A. He said that it had taken a more serious turn when he told me that he had lame cattle and he had lame hogs—two, I believe—and when they had a vesicular disease it was obvious to me that some action should be taken, and taken very promptly.

Q. What did you do then?—A. I called Dr. Childs on the phone and told him what had happened, what the conversation had been which I had with Dr. Carlson. Now, Dr. Carlson had asked for men from the laboratory to be sent out there to assist in diagnosis. I discussed that matter with Dr. Childs and after a discussion it was decided that we would ask Dr. Mitchell to send a man out there; but Dr. Mitchell pointed out to me that there would be nothing gained by doing that because Carlson had been at the lab, at the short course, and understood how to take specimens. He assured me that they could be shipped with safety and that he could handle them with safety at the lab. On the strength of that and his assurance I wired on the 13th to have the specimens taken and forwarded to the lab. I was very much interested in knowing that whoever took the specimens had done it in accordance with Dr. Mitchell's instructions, and I had Dr. Mitchell deliver to me by messenger a copy of his instructions which were that same day forwarded by air mail to Dr. Christie in Regina.

Q. You say that after Dr. Carlson phoned you you phoned Dr. Childs informing him of the conversation you had had with Dr. Carlson?—A. That is right.

Q. At that time was there any suggestion on your part to Dr. Childs that it might be foot and mouth disease?—A. At that moment it looked highly suspicious but we could not say that it was foot and mouth disease.

Q. No mention was made by you of the desirability of having specimens sent?—A. There were no specimens, they were not discussed at that moment.

Q. And then you got in touch with Dr. Mitchell and took the position that specimens should be obtained?—A. That is right.

Q. Therefore, after you had decided that specimens be sent, were you surprised that your order was countermanded by Dr. Childs in view of the conversation you had had with him.—A. I did not know that the instructions were countermanded until I saw it in the report here.

Q. Until when?—A. Until I read it in this report.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. What date would that be?—A. It would be the date you gentlemen here had the meeting.

Q. About a week ago?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. I suppose you consider it is very fortunate they didn't get that countermanding order, otherwise the situation might have been very different from what it is today—A. Well, I do not know anything about that.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cardiff.

By Mr. Cardiff:

Q. I have just a couple of words, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask Dr. Hall if he got any copies before he came to this room of the questions Mr. Stewart asked; if he knew they were going to be asked?—A. No, I wasn't aware of them; any more than he wanted statistical information.

Q. You had no knowledge of the questions he was going to ask you before he asked them?—A. Well, I presumed that questions were going to be asked.

MR. STEWART: —any member of this committee can prepare a list of them there and you followed them down, and it looked to me to be arranged. Was it arranged or wasn't it?

MR. STEWART: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

MR. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

MR. STEWART: —any member of this committee can prepare a list of questions and ask them, any member of the committee.

MR. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. I noticed that when Mr. Quelch was asking the witness questions now a gentleman alongside of the witness was whispering in his ear. I would like to know who that gentleman is and what authority he has for being here and why he has been coaching a number of witnesses on this committee.

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I think I am as competent to answer that as anyone. The members of the committee well know that when I am before a committee of the House, the committee of the whole, I have men sitting at my desk all the time just to give me detailed information. There is no person who can sit before this committee and answer every question that one might wish to ask with any hope of being able to give the information right away unless someone is sitting there who can supply it immediately it is asked. And now, Mr. Phillips is a most competent man, the most competent man we have in the department to answer, or to get the answers to any questions you want to ask. He is not on the stand himself but he is available as an official of our department to provide that information to anyone of whom it may be asked.

MR. BRYCE: Every courtesy should have been extended to him and he should have been introduced to the committee.

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: In a committee of the whole House I do not introduce the men who come in and sit in front of me, and I do not know that this is any more important a place than a committee of the House, I presume

they are both the same, that it is the same here as it is in the House. And this gentleman, incidentally, can give me more information than anybody else I know of, he can supply me with more information than any other person of whom I know in the department and we have him here for that purpose, to help us and to help you and in that way we save wasting time when you ask us questions and we have to ask you to wait to get the answer for you.

Mr. BRYCE: The main thing is, has he got the information.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: As I say, with him here, we are able to give you the information without delay. Without him here it would in some cases be most difficult to do that and we would have to ask you to wait until we could get the information for you. The young man here can give you the information as fast as you ask for it and he can give it to me too. I ask a question and he looks it up in the documents. He knows where the documents are. The witness can't find them, but immediately he hears the question this young man looks them up and gets them for you; without him, you would have to wait for us to bring the answers to you tomorrow, or at some other time. We have tried to speed the activities of this committee by having a man here who can provide that service for us, and that is all we are doing.

Mr. ARGUE: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the gentleman beside the witness passing over documents. Mr. Cardiff asked a question of the witness: was the witness aware of the questions Mr. Stewart asked him this afternoon before Mr. Stewart rose to ask those questions; and then I noticed that a conversation transpired between these two gentlemen; it certainly should be in our record, whether the witness was aware that these questions were going to be asked. I am all for the information being given, all of the information; but on a question that affects the knowledge of the witness and is within the knowledge of the witness only, he should not require coaching on that type of question.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cardiff:

Mr. STEWART: I object to the word "coaching". I think any member can ask any question he likes and they can ask it in advance.

Mr. ARGUE: All right, put it in advance, then.

Mr. CARDIFF: As it appears to me those questions were framed before the member ever asked the questions because he had them right there at his fingertips and he had the answers ready for them. That is all right. But I would just like to ask this question. Did the hon. Minister of Agriculture himself have any meeting with the members of this committee this morning, the Liberal members of this committee this morning, before coming in?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I would answer that by saying that if the Conservative members want to see me tonight or tomorrow morning I will see them.

By Mr. Cardiff:

Q. Just one other question I would like to ask at this time and that is, Dr. Hall, did you ever at any time have instructions from Dr. Childs not to have any tests made or any specimens gathered in this case?—A. There is possibly no direct instructions. It is a recognized fact in the department that when you suspect a serious infectious disease that a diagnosis should be made on the ground as far as possible and we cannot have people sending specimens from everywhere in to our lab and not know what we are doing.—Q. I do not think that answers my question exactly. I realize that you cannot have everyone sending in samples, but were instructions given at any time that these specimens were not to be gathered?—A. Well now, in the Animal Diseases Emergency Organization I believe we did instruct our men not to forward specimens, but of course they were to get their directions from head office before they made any attempt.

Q. Well, I understood—perhaps I am wrong, but I do not think I am—I understood that Dr. Childs had countermanded anyone from sending down specimens, is that right?—A. Well, he countermanded my order. Are you referring to the order I issued?

Q. No, perhaps—I do not know, but is it right that he did countermand the order of whoever it was to send down those specimens and did not want them sent down?—A. Now, get it clear. I issued an order to send these specimens down.

Q. You issued the order?—A. I issued the order and the specimens came down.

Q. Dr. Childs did not instruct you not to issue the order?—A. No.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, just to clear up the point that is on, I think Dr. Hall has given us the clearest explanation of what happened that we have heard. As a matter of fact he has cleared up a little doubt in my own mind. Dr. Hall has said in the first place that he was away sick from November until January. He came back and came back onto the scene and Dr. Childs went away on his vacation and then when he got this word he contacted Dr. Childs and between them they had determined that it was best to send this help out to Dr. Carlson and he discussed that with Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Mitchell thought it would be better to have a sample taken out there by Dr. Carlson. Now, he said he gave the order to have the samples taken as I understand it.

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. Is that correct?—A. That is correct.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He gave the order to have the samples taken out there by Dr. Carlson. I think Dr. Childs said when he found that out he did countermand the order. Now, what Dr. Hall is telling us is that while he sent a telegram it never did countermand the order due to the fact that it did not get there soon enough; in other words, the order never was countermanded, as he says, he heard about it for the first time on these records that anybody had sent a wire to countermand it and all I am pointing out is this:

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. Dr. Hall, would it not be true that that did not cause any delay at all? Would it not be true as a result of that that you issued your order, the order went out, the samples were gathered, they were sent back here, the countermanded order did not get there in time to make any difference, so that the result would be that the samples were here just as soon as they would have got here under any circumstances at that time?—A. There was no delay between the time Dr. Carlson got the instructions and Dr. Mitchell got the material.

Q. That is the point I wanted to clear up. You say there was no delay between the time that Dr. Carlson got the instructions and the time the materials arrived?—A. No.

Mr. CARDIFF: I realize that, but the fact remains that Dr. Childs did countermand the order?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He attempted to but it did not get there in time.

Mr. CARDIFF: But that was not his fault.

Mr. WRIGHT: I want to just clear up one point that was raised by Mr. Laing, the member for Vancouver South, with regard to that statement which was put on the record yesterday. I am afraid Mr. Laing could not have been listening very closely because he seems to have the entire statement twisted. The statement had regard to a bovine type of encephalomyelitis appearing in the southwest corner of the province of Saskatchewan. It was not horse encephalomyelitis at all, and it was not an indication that there was not cooperation. The statement simply said that when the provincial authority on contagious diseases

in the province issued a pamphlet or a statement with regard to this disease that the dominion authority in the person at that time of Dr. Christie, told him that this was the responsibility of the dominion department and that any statements issued with regard to a contagious disease such as the one that he had issued a statement with regard to should come through the dominion department as represented by himself in the province of Saskatchewan and through the department in Saskatchewan.

Mr. LAING: What year was it?

Mr. WRIGHT: It does not state here the year. I understood it was 1944, but it is not here.

Mr. LAING: What application would it have to the present situation?

Mr. WRIGHT: The only application it would have to the present situation is this, that if the provincial authorities had been told that contagious diseases were the responsibility of the federal government, naturally they would continue to believe that and would feel that their responsibility was carried out when they notified the dominion authority, Dr. Christie, in the province of Saskatchewan. That is the only application that the statement that I read had to this particular case.

Mr. LAING: Do you think there is any lack of cooperation today?

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not think so. To my knowledge there has been complete cooperation as far as I know between the authorities out there, and I think the evidence given in the committee here would indicate that too.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Wright, I wonder if you would permit me on a question of privilege. This group of men who filed in here a while ago I think are a delegation who want to see me and if I am correct in that I am going out in a moment and I would like to announce to them that if they follow me we will find a room to meet in. I think they are the men who want to meet me.

Mr. WRIGHT: I presume we can go ahead?

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. Just a moment, we will have a little recess while they are filing out. If these gentlemen are going to follow Mr. Gardiner we will just take a minute.

—Recess.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Dr. Hall, when you took over charge of the office in the absence of Dr. Childs, when he went on his holidays, did you forward these reports coming from Dr. Christie or Dr. James or whoever was in charge in Saskatchewan on to your next superior, Mr. Young, in the Production Department?—A. No, those reports go on file. Now, do not be confused. We receive reports from our inspectors dealing with a visit to the premises. He inspects the stock and he finds nothing. He does not issue a declaration. Now, what you are talking about is the declaration. That is what the question is here; it is a declaration. When I go on to your farm and I suspect that your livestock is infected with contagious disease, I have the power to order that stock quarantined or maybe slaughtered and I make out a written declaration. That declaration is handed to you. Then I make out a report which is attached to the declaration and it goes through the normal channels to Ottawa.

Now, the question you are asking is, have the reports that come through dealing with the inspection of all of these cattle that I referred to been referred to the minister. No. They come in and the inspector has examined your cattle or gone on to your premises, he finds they are all healthy. He says so. He has to make a report and that report is on file. It is on file in our office.

Q. Well, if you had been receiving reports in your office of a contagious disease of a visacular nature in the province of Saskatchewan. Did you notify Mr. Young—either yourself or Dr. Childs, to your knowledge notify Mr. Young that there were a series of reports coming into your office from Saskatchewan that there was a visacular stomatitis outbreak in the province of Saskatchewan in the neighbourhood of Regina or did these reports die in your office and no further information go on to any superior officer?—A. No, they do not die, not at all. Those reports are on a file in our office and are looked over by one of the officers of the division but I did not personally—I expect that Dr. Childs did—discuss with Mr. Young and probably also with the deputy the visacular condition that existed in Saskatchewan.

Q. You think that that would be normal, that they got these reports in a series—a series of them, not just one report but several reports that there was an outbreak of visacular stomatitis—that Mr. Young would be notified immediately to that effect?—A. Well, I would not say on the vesicular stomatitis, no. Probably he would not be. Now, I cannot tell you whether he was notified or he was not notified. All I can tell you is that when I took over he was notified.

Q. Did he indicate that he had known of this outbreak before you told him? Did he indicate to you that he had knowledge of this before you informed him of it?—A. Oh, I am sorry, I cannot answer that because the minute I issued the orders to forward the specimens I acquainted Mr. Young of the fact and showed him the telegram and letter I had forwarded to Dr. Christie. Everybody knew.

Q. On what date was that, that you had your first conversation with Mr. Young?—A. On the 13th.

Q. That was the first time you had ever had any conversation with Mr. Young with regard to the outbreak in Saskatchewan?—A. As far as I can recall.

Q. You do not consider that you should have been notified when your order to have the samples sent down here was countermanded? You stated that you had no notice of that until you saw it in the report given to this committee. You would not consider it as non-co-operative, that someone should countermand your order and give you no notice of the countermanding of your order?—A. I would expect that my chief has the right to countermand any order I issued.

Q. Even without giving you any notice that he was countermanding the order?

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we cannot hear the questions down here.

Mr. WRIGHT: I asked the witness if he considered there was full co-operation between him and his chief, when his chief countermanded his order and gave him no notice of having countermanded that order.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you through now, Mr. Wright?

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not know whether or not that requires technical advice, but the witness seems to be getting it.

Mr. McCUBBIN: I think he answered that question, did he not?

By Mr. Wright:

Q. You answered that question, did you?—A. Yes.

Q. What was the answer you gave? I asked you if you considered there was full co-operation between you and Dr. Childs, after you had given an order and Dr. Childs had countermanded that order without giving you any notice of the fact that he had countermanded your order, and in view of the fact that the first you knew about it was when the report was issued to the committee here?

Mr. JUTRAS: He answered that question before.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. I am asking him and if he cares to repeat his answer, all very well—
A. I told you that I believed that my chief had the right to countermand any order I might issue.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you speak louder, please.

The WITNESS: I consider that my chief has the right to countermand any order I might give. He is the responsible head. Now you say to me: "is there any lack of co-operation?"

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Would you consider that to be a lack of co-operation?—A. I have got to say this: that since that was done and up to this moment I have not noticed any.

Q. That is all I asked the witness, and I think he was entitled to answer without some of the committee smiling about it.

Mr. STEWART: Cannot the committee smile?

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, much of the evidence that has been given is of such a nature as to make the committee smile.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed, Mr. Wright, please.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. In view of the outbreak in the United States in 1932 in which there was difficulty in distinguishing as to whether or not it was foot and mouth disease, do you consider that we have in Canada today a lot more facilities for making a quicker and better diagnosis than they had at that time?—A. Oh, undoubtedly!

Q. Do you think we made full and complete use of all the facilities we had in Canada at the earliest date possible with regard to this present outbreak?—A. Well, you are asking me now to refer to hindsight. We can all tell you now, but it is a different proposition when you are on the spot. One must remember that in this outbreak, I think you must take a broad view of it, that you had what now our hind-sight tells us was a benign outbreak of type A virus. That is apparently a pretty slow virus at the start. Now, there could be a good deal of confusion, and I might add this for your information, sir, as well as for the information of the committee, that there are, as Dr. Mitchell told you this morning, four types of virus. No. I am wrong, I mean three types of virus, A, C, and O. Now, had this been C virus, the picture might have been greatly changed; or had it been A-5 virus, which is considered a hot virus, the picture would again have been changed. But asking me what I would have done had I been on the ground at that particular time under those circumstances is somewhat difficult to answer.

Q. That is not what I asked you. I asked if you thought that full use had been made of facilities which we have in Canada for determining a virus disease? This disease out there was vesicular stomatitis which is a virus disease. Do you think that the full facilities which we have available in Canada were used to determine whether or not it was vesicular stomatitis? If I understand it rightly, we have a laboratory over there in Hull, which has been built at great cost to ourselves and to the nation, one purpose of which is to determine virus diseases. We had a virus disease out there, and do you think that in the case of a virus disease such as vesicular stomatitis when it is prevalent, that we made full use of the facilities which we have in Canada to determine what that disease was?—A. No, because Dr. Mitchell told you here this morning that he did not know there was vesicular stomatitis out there.

Q. No, he did not know but your department knew. There certainly could be no blame on Dr. Mitchell's department, but were the facilities available in your department for determining vesicular stomatitis used?—A. Well, the laboratory was not used.

Q. That is all I wanted.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ross—then Mr. Sinnott, then Mr. Harkness.

Mr. Ross: I thought Mr. Harkness was on earlier.

Mr. HARKNESS: I got up early in the proceedings but I have been passed over every time.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Doctor, you said the Health of Animals division had been established to prevent the introduction of contagious diseases into this country, and you mentioned making regulations and so on. Now, have you any knowledge of an agricultural delegation visiting out there from Mexico last fall?—A. No. I have not.

Q. You never heard of it at all?—A. No.

Q. What co-operation do you have or what kind of a working agreement with the Department of Immigration do you have? I am thinking for instance of this chap who you put through the tests in the Hull laboratory. Willi something—I never remember his name—Jean.

Some MEMBERS: Bruentjen.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. He stated publicly and otherwise that he had left a badly infected farm where the entire herd had gone down with the disease and he had come to this country. Do you have any working arrangement where those immigrants go through a process of fumigation or where steps are taken to prevent them bringing the disease into this country?—A. Yes, we have. Since the outbreak occurred we have fumigated all working clothes and what have you of immigrants coming into this country—unless the country of origin has facilities for doing it.

Now, as far as Holland is concerned at the moment, they have disinfection stations established I believe in their federal department there; and they have a very elaborate set-up for the disinfection not only of clothing but of any farm implements such as forks, milk stools, machinery, and anything that may have originated from a farm. Everything that might be likely to carry the infection is disinfected. It is accompanied by a certificate by the authorities in that country. If it arrives here and it is not accompanied by that certificate we do the fumigation.

Q. That did not apply before this outbreak?—A. That did not apply before this outbreak because it is a tremendous job. When I spoke some time ago with regard to restrictions on different commodities that come into this country, we try to regulate those things which are most likely to carry infection or serious animal diseases. Now, we cannot always get them all and in this particular case that we have under review we were not disinfecting immigrants' clothing.

Mr. STEWART: Did they have that in effect in the United States up until recently?

The WITNESS: It has never been in effect in the United States to my knowledge.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. I am not asking about the United States; I am asking about this country at the present time. I suppose you have regulations in the customs department that certain articles or certain goods packed in straw and so on—A. Yes, if

you bring anything in from a foreign country packed in hay, straw, or other raw products of the soil, you will be held up at the boundary. Do not get angry at the Health of Animals division because we are going to see it is disinfected—and you are going to pay for it.

Q. That is just as I think it should be? Are you satisfied that was done previous to this outbreak?—A. That has been done for years with respect to merchandise packed in straw or other raw products of the soil.

Q. You are satisfied of that?—A. I am. The proof of it is that our regulations have been practical and we have been able to keep foot and mouth disease out of the country for years.

Now, in so far as the Saskatchewan outbreak is concerned you have the history of the man who was on the infected premises and, 17 days later he was on another farm—and there you have it. Now, make your own deductions.

Q. As I understand it you say your officials had not checked over this agricultural delegation from Mexico at all?—A. I would not say that. I said I had no knowledge of it.

Q. No knowledge?—A. No.

Q. With respect to some of the evidence given this morning about this final test at the Waas farm on March 9th and the findings on March 13th, you would receive the results of the test?—A. I believe it would come into the office but I am not qualified to answer the question. It is a laboratory question for a science man entirely.

Q. I quite agree with you there, but I should imagine the information would go from you to one of your colleagues—probably your senior, Dr. Childs. It would go to your office and you would be much concerned with the test. You have no knowledge as to the date you received that at your office?—A. No, I have not. It was, of course, after the outbreak was established. I imagine it would be some time in March but I am not just sure.

Q. I think it would be because I give you the date—and I said according to the evidence this morning the final test was on March 9th and the finding was on March 13th. It would be following that date.

Q. You have no knowledge of getting the report?—A. No, I have not.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott.

MR. SINNOTT: I have just one observation to make before I ask Dr. Hall three or four questions. I think that this committee is here for the purpose of getting some firsthand information about the circumstances and not to be continually trying to corrupt this meeting with provincial politics.

MR. ARGUE: I agree with you 100 per cent.

MR. WRIGHT: Talk to some of your own members about that.

MR. ARGUE: Talk to Mr. Stewart.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. One of the hon. members has raised his voice and I would certainly like to have the opportunity of asking the member for Melfort to produce the balance of the letter which we were trying to get yesterday. It would do us a lot of good. He is the one I referred to. Evidently the cap fitted him and he has raised his voice.

Now, Dr. Hall, I understand from the evidence you have given today that you are quite an old timer as a veterinarian. You said you have been in this business for 40 years, and that is a long, long time in any profession. Could you tell me, Doctor, what relation Dr. Christie plays in your department, of the Health of Animals branch. Do you know Dr. Christie?—A. N.D.?

Q. Yes?—A. Certainly. N.D. is the district officer for the province of Saskatchewan.

Q. Would you know how long Dr. Christie has been with that department?
—A. I am only hazarding a guess, but I think since 1910 or 1911, I am not quite sure.

Q. That is, with the Dominion government?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you any access to files other than your own, that is, you would not see correspondence between Dr. Childs and Dr. Christie?—A. I would see carbon copies of them, yes.

Q. You would? Would you recall that on January 4 a day letter went to Dr. Christie from Dr. Childs, and it reads like this:

“Awaiting Dr. James report vesicular stomatitis Burns feed lots Regina reported wired December 28. Long delay not understood. Please expedite. Repeat please expedite. T. Childs”

Now, I would gather from this wire sent by Dr. Childs to Dr. Christie that it was urgent, and in looking through the files here I do not find an answer of any kind from Dr. Christie until the 13th February. Now, did you at any time see these files or these wires?—A. Did you say that that wire was sent on the 4th January?

Q. Yes, from Ottawa on January 4, 1952.—A. January 4?

Q. Yes.—A. I believe I told the committee that I was off ill from November 27 until January 14.

Q. Oh, that is correct. Now, could you see any reason, or can you see any reason or give any explanation why Dr. Christie did not reply to Dr. James' wire before February 13?—A. I do not know.

Q. You do not know?—A. No.

Q. Well, Dr. Hall, whether by accident or otherwise, don't you think that the department you are in has rendered not only to Canada but to the world a method of establishing the foot and mouth disease that has never before been followed. Is that a fact?—A. I would have you repeat that, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. I say, don't you think that your department, whether by accident or otherwise, have found a way of diagnosing the foot and mouth disease which has not only rendered a service to Canada but to the world as a whole, of being the one to establish, determine, the disease as it is at the present time?—A. Well, you are asking me a pretty broad question because we do know that the most advanced centre in the world today is Purbright, England. They have the diagnostic facilities there, but I do think that with the diagnostic facilities we have in this country we have rendered quite a service.

Q. Well, in spite of the fact that what has previously been said in the House of Commons on January 4 by the member for Brant-Wentworth, that the only proper diagnosis to be taken should be in the field, that you should inject the virus into a horse.

Mr. ARGUE: He did not say that.

Mr. SINNOTT: I am doing the questioning at the moment.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. In other words it can't be done completely in the field, in order to determine what it is you must have specimens on which you can make a laboratory test before arriving at a final diagnosis as to what the disease is; and, I think we were told that it takes about 5 days for it to become apparent? Is that right?—A. That is right.

Mr. HARKNESS: Dr. Hall, what is your understanding of the purpose of this little tableau which you and Mr. Stewart took part in at the beginning of today's session?

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: any member of this committee—and I think if my friends had done it on the first day there would not have been the repetition of questions being asked two, three or four times, and the reading of books by the honourable member for Assiniboia and the reading of text books, and so forth. Any member has the right to prepare his questions ahead of time and get down to the business of this committee.

Mr. HARKNESS: I do not question the propriety of it at all.

Mr. STEWART: You refer to it as a tableau between the witness and myself.

Mr. HARKNESS: I said it was a tableau. I asked what was the purpose, what was the intent and purpose of the tableau and that is the answer I want.

The WITNESS: I can't give you that. You might as well ask me the purpose of your questions. I may be—

Mr. STEWART: I am going to prepare some more questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. You, of course, undoubtedly took some time preparing the answers to those questions which Mr. Stewart submitted; is that a fact, Dr. Hall?—A. We got this out of our records.

Q. It took you some time to go through these records, did it not?—A. I didn't go through the records, I am not a record man. We have the records here.

Q. Who did go through the records to get the information?—A. That is the man, right here.

Q. Mr. Phillips prepared the answers?—A. Yes.

Mr. STEWART: Do you object to the answers?

Mr. HARKNESS: I think it might have occurred to you to wonder what the purpose was—

Mr. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder what the purpose of this questioning is.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, I think I should be entitled to ask my questions without these interruptions; I did not interrupt these other fellows when they asked their questions.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What has that got to do with foot and mouth disease.

Mr. STEWART: Apparently he doesn't like the answers.

Mr. HARKNESS: I will phrase this in a different way and perhaps it will satisfy these gentlemen.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. Was the purpose, in your opinion, to defend the slowness with which the diagnosis of foot and mouth disease was made in this particular case?—A. You are asking me for an opinion?

Q. Yes.—A. I have given you a statement of facts. What the purpose is behind it, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. STEWART: Which appear in the records and you can look them up.

Mr. HARKNESS: That appeared to be the purpose Mr. Stewart had in mind. We don't seem to be getting any further with regard to this question so I will leave it at that.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. Now, Dr. Hall, when did you first become alarmed that this outbreak in Saskatchewan was not stomatitis, but that it was possibly, or might be, foot and mouth disease?—A. Well, I can't say that I became alarmed; but, as I said before, when I returned on the 14th of January, the man who had been taking my place drew my attention to the fact that there was stomatitis out there. I took the matter up with Dr. Childs immediately and he assured me that it was a vesicular disease quite similar to the one that we had in 1938 and 1939, and that he was going out—which he did—and he would look into the matter; and, apart from that, I went on with my job.

Q. Well, there must have been some point at which you became alarmed that this might be foot and mouth disease?—A. I really was alarmed from the 12th of February.

Q. When was that date?—A. That was the first date I really was alarmed on the 12th.

Q. Prior to that time, you were receiving these inspection reports, the reports the details of which are contained in these returns we got here?—A. Well, as I told you before, I was away from the office from the 27th of November until the 14th of January, and much of that went on before I got back.

Q. Of course, a considerable number of these are after the 14th of January; were you receiving these after you got back to the office from the 14th of January on?—A. No, because I was busy with preparing material for orders.

Q. You did not receive these then, or if you did receive these—A. Those reports that you speak of there, they come into the office all right.

Q. Yes, but I take it then that you were busy with orders of various kinds and you did not consider these particular reports were your particular business at that?—A. Not at that moment.

Q. So you did not pay particular attention to these reports that were received in your office after you came back from your sick leave on the 14th of January?—A. The man who took my place while I was away drew my attention to them and I drew it to Dr. Childs' attention. Dr. Childs went west, I think it was the same day, and when he came back he was certain it was stomatitis.

Q. But would these various reports of lameness in these cattle which you diagnosed as foot rot, did they not appear to you as being a suspicious circumstance?—A. Not at that time.

Q. Not at that time?—A. No.

Q. Well then, did you yourself go out to Regina Dr. Hall?—A. No sir.

Q. You were never out there?—A. No sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gour:

Mr. GOUR: Is there not some way by which we can avoid all this repetition? It seems to me that Dr. Hall, like the other witness, has given us a very complete story of his part in this, and here we have the same questions being asked all over again. He has told us about the matter having been called to his attention when he came back from his holidays, that he immediately got in touch with Dr. Childs, that every effort was made to diagnose the disease, and that everything possible was done to get the matter under control; they put their best men out in the field, among them Dr. Carlson. It seems to me that we should get on with this evidence and let these men get back on the job as quickly as possible. That is what the country needs—not politics.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Charlton.

By Dr. Charlton:

Q. Dr. Hall, most of the questions I have to ask you have already been asked and you will pardon me if I repeat some of them because I am not certain that I can remember them all. Dr. Hall, I believe that you stated that you were away from the office from the 27th of November until January 14th; that is true?—A. Yes.

Q. And when you came back Dr. Stewart who had been taking your place when you were away informed you of the fact that this vesicular stomatitis was in Saskatchewan?—That is correct.

Q. And that they had this particular condition, this particular stomatitis in Saskatchewan?—A. That is right.

Q. And you did on that occasion, or shortly afterwards speak to Dr. Childs about this?—A. That is correct.

Q. And I believe you stated that Dr. Childs had been out there previous to that; is that true?—A. No, I did not say that, I said that Dr. Childs left almost immediately.

Q. And he went out?—A. Yes.

Q. He was out there on the 17th—I don't know what day he left?—A. I believe he left the same day I came back to work.

Q. On the 14th?—A. I believe it was.

Q. But you did talk it over with Dr. Childs before he left?—A. I did.

Q. And you did naturally speak of foot and mouth disease, or the danger of foot and mouth disease, in that conversation?—A. I do not know that I mentioned foot and mouth disease. We spoke about the vesicular condition in these animals and we wanted to arrive, of course, at a diagnosis, to know what we were having; and he told me that he was going to look into it; at least he was going out for other purposes and when he was there he would look into it; which I believe he did.

Q. And when you speak of a vesicular disease the first thing that comes to your mind is that it might be foot and mouth disease, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Dr. Childs went out there on the 14th and he assured you; how could he be so sure that it was nothing else but stomatitis although he did not say it was—of course, you cannot answer that—after he had been out did he state to you any reason for saying he was so sure it was stomatitis?—A. I believe that was due to the fact that he had been in the stomatitis outbreak in 1938 and 1939; he had dealt with stomatitis.

Q. He had dealt with stomatitis?—A. With stomatitis, more than I ever had.

Q. He had not been out and seen this?—A. He went there.

Q. But he did assure you that it was stomatitis and there was nothing to worry about?—A. Nothing to worry about, that is correct.

Q. There was nothing done then so far as you know—I mean, Dr. Childs did go out on the 16th and place a quarantine on the Burn's plant?—A. Yes.

Q. As far as you know you did not have anything more to do with it until the 12th of February?—A. That is right.

Q. And you received a telephone call from Dr. Carlson?—A. That is right.

Q. Then you called Dr. Childs at his home?—A. That is right.

Q. Dr. Childs was on statutory leave at that time I understand?—A. That is correct.

Q. You called Dr. Childs at his home?—A. I did.

Q. Did he say at that time that you were not to have samples sent down?—A. Samples were not discussed at that time.

Q. You did not discuss the samples at all?—A. We did not discuss samples at all. Dr. Carlson's request to me over the phone was for assistance and he asked if it would be possible to send a laboratory man, a virologist to look these cattle over. Now, after I discussed that matter with Dr. Childs he agreed that we should ask Dr. Mitchell to send one of the laboratory men but Dr. Mitchell assured me that it would be probably a waste of time to do that because after all the man that he sent up would only collect specimens and send them down because the virus unit was here. So the man was not sent and I issued the orders the next morning to Christie to have the material forwarded.

Q. And Dr. Carlson had been at the school and was quite capable of taking the samples?—A. That is right. I think that is in the record, is it not?

Q. Yes. Now, you did not take to Dr. Childs—after you contacted Dr. Mitchell Dr. Childs did not contact you again to see what had been done?—A. I am quite sure that on that same afternoon, on the afternoon of the 13th—I am quite sure that he came in the office. I am quoting from memory now, but I believe it was the 13th he came in and I told him just what I had done and on the same day I notified Mr. Young, the director.

Q. Up until that time you had no knowledge of Mr. Young or Dr. Taggart having been advised of this condition up until the 12th or 13th when you advised them yourself? When Dr. Childs was away on his statutory leave you were in charge, I understand?—A. That is right.

Q. And you did, when you heard from Dr. Carlson, get in touch with Dr. Mitchell?—A. That is right.

Q. Arranged for the samples?—A. That is right.

Q. And then you got in touch with Mr. Young?—A. That is right.

Q. Did you get in touch with Dr. Taggart at the same time or did Mr. Young?—A. No, I did not. I am sure Mr. Young would do that.

Q. Ordinarily you would not have been able to do that, Dr. Hall, had it not been for the fact that Dr. Childs was away on holidays and you were left in charge?—A. That is right, Dr. Childs would be the man who would do it.

Q. You would not go over the head of Dr. Childs, naturally?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Now, you think you are not sure, but you think that you had another conversation with Dr. Childs on the 13th, that is the same day that you wired for the samples to be sent down?—A. I believe it was.

Q. Dr. Childs did not say anything to you at that time about countermanding your order?—A. No.

Q. It was not until the 15th when Dr. Childs had come back to the office that he found out about this wire going forward from yourself to Dr. Christie asking that samples be sent out? He so stated in this committee that he came back to the office for his mail on the 15th. Did you see Dr. Childs on the 15th of February?—No, I did not.

Q. Was Dr. Childs back in the office working on the 15th or when did he start back to work after he had had his statutory leave, can you tell me that?—A. Well, so far as I am aware and know, I believe he came back Saturday the 16th. Was not Saturday the 16th?

Q. Yes.—A. I believe—now, I am not sure of this but I believe in the meantime he had had a long distance call with Dr. Carlson and he was coming back to the office on the 16th and I believe that he had to make his arrangements for flying out to Regina and I believe at that time that he discussed it with Mr. Young and the deputy.

Q. Dr. Childs flew to Regina on the 16th in company with Dr. Wells?—A. That is right.

Q. But you did not know of the countermanding wire which was sent from Dr. Childs' residence on the night of the 15th?—A. Once again I will say that I have never seen that wire until I saw it in this record.

Q. Until it was tabled in the committee or in the House of Commons?—A. That is correct.

Q. Nor were you told about it at all?—A. No.

Q. You did not know anything about it?—A. No.

Q. And on the 12th of February then was the first that you knew, was it, that anyone in the field had a suspicion?—A. Yes, that is the first time I knew that there was any grave suspicion and Dr. Carlson expressed anxiety over the condition he found and he asked for help.

Q. When you came back from your sick leave Dr. Stewart advised you of this condition in Saskatchewan?—A. That is correct.

Q. Did he mention at the time that anyone had suggested to him what it was?—A. No, I do not believe he did. He told me that there was vesicular disease out there.

Q. Nobody mentioned anything else?—A. No. I do not think that Dr. Stewart did.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest we come on again at 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION

May 6, 1952.

8.00 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen.

I have on my list the names of Mr. Decore and Mr. Wood. I see that neither one of them are here. Mr. McLean?

Dr. Orlan Hall, Assistant Veterinary Director General of Canada, recalled:

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. Dr. Hall, I understood you to say in answer to an earlier question in an earlier part of your evidence, that wherever there are outbreaks of foot and mouth disease they are reported to you? Is that correct, that from time to time you receive reports, that the department keeps informed by other countries of all outbreaks of foot and mouth disease?—A. One of the channels through which we get those reports is the Department of Trade and Commerce, through their foreign representatives. Another source of information is through the Office of the International Epizootics, in France. That organization collects information from various countries and periodically notifies us of outbreaks in those countries, the number of animals involved and so on.

Q. Can you tell us what the position was last November with regard to foot and mouth disease in Europe, Mexico and various other places?—A. Now, you will have to divide Europe from Mexico. Last November, if my memory serves me right, Europe was in bad shape, there was quite a large outbreak. It was really general—Denmark, West Germany, Holland, Belgium and there were quite a considerable number of outbreaks in those countries. I can't give you the exact figures. If you had mentioned that you were going to ask for that this afternoon I would have been able to give you more information. In so far as Mexico is concerned, I do not believe that they have had an outbreak there for the last year and so that would take in November—that is, a known outbreak.

Q. You mean there has been no new outbreak there?—A. No new outbreak.

Q. So then there was no foot and mouth disease at that time, to your knowledge?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. What about Great Britain?—A. Great Britain has had periodically outbreaks of foot and mouth disease for more than a year.

Q. Now, would you consider then that the situation, definitely, in those countries you mentioned, was perhaps worse last year than it had been the year before, or than was normal? Is that a normal situation?—A. No, it is not a normal situation. There is a wave of it, you might almost call it an epidemic of foot and mouth disease in Europe.

Q. Is it the policy of your department to keep officials in the country generally, the ones working for the Department of Agriculture and the private practitioners, informed of outbreaks in all countries, or is that just for the use of headquarters?—A. No, that is for use at headquarters, so we know what is going on.

Q. It has been suggested that perhaps foot and mouth disease was carried from the continent of Europe by birds. Do you consider that a reasonable supposition?—A. Well, I know what you are getting at. It has been said that starlings from Europe flew across the channel, flew to southern England to feed on the grain in the feed lots and therefore it may be possible to carry infection in. That I believe was the theory of Sir Donald Cabot who preceded Sir Thomas Dowling as the chief veterinary officer for the British Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. I am not prepared to say.

Q. Is it possible for this disease to be carried on vegetable matter, straw or clothing; is that creditable?—A. We believe so.

Q. Do you take any steps to keep informed of the outbreaks of other disease, particularly stomatitis, in other countries of the world; or, is that disease considered serious enough for that?—A. Well, the other countries of the world—I can't recall a country that has ever reported vesicular stomatitis; but I would have to check the records to find that out. But you must remember that when we place our restriction on importations of animals and animal products—straw, hay and products of the soil—coming in to this country, we are not only looking at foot and mouth disease, there are many other diseases, and many countries report those diseases.

Q. Then I take it that you are not appraised of what the situation is with regard to vesicular stomatitis in other countries of the world?—A. No, I am not.

Q. Then, as to the efficiency of your department; were veterinarians especially alerted, or are they, or were they ever as a matter of fact especially alerted to the danger of any particular disease, foot and mouth disease or any other disease? What I mean by that is this; last November there was foot and mouth disease in other countries which reached almost epidemic proportions and that was at a time when there were a large number of immigrants arriving from both Great Britain and western Germany, and at the season when bird migrations took place. Were the veterinarians especially alerted to these things at that time?—A. Our port of entry men along the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard were alerted with regard to the foot and mouth situation in Europe and other countries and it was impressed upon them to insist on the enforcement of the regulations very rigidly on anything that might convey the infection of any foreign disease.

Q. Which is considered to be the more contagious, foot and mouth disease or vesicular stomatitis?—A. Oh, foot and mouth disease.

Q. It is more contagious?—A. Certainly.

Q. That is it will be more easy inadvertently to carry it from one place to another?—A. Quite.

Q. So that when it comes to a question of the outbreak of one type or the other it would be more logical to expect it to be foot and mouth disease than vesicular stomatitis; wouldn't you say that?—A. No. Now, let me clarify this in your mind and in the mind of the committee again. Earlier I made the remark that it was obvious from what we knew, from what we know now, that we were dealing with a benign case of foot and mouth disease caused by virus A. Now, that disease obviously did not spread rapidly. I would say this, if that had been the C type it would have been a different picture entirely, or, if it had been A-5. Now, you must realize that it spread very slowly.

Q. Apparently you did not quite understand my question because what I was getting at, what I meant, was this: you have an outbreak of some disease, you do not know what it is, but you know that it is either the one or the other. From the clinical point of view this foot and mouth disease is more easily carried, is more contagious, it would be more logical to suppose that it would get into some area more readily than vesicular stomatitis. I am asking for information. Is that correct?—A. Well, I am just a little bit at a loss as to how to answer your question from the way you put it. May I make this

observation, sir: are you trying to convey the impression that stomatitis would have spread from farm to farm in this particular district in the same manner as foot and mouth?

Q. No, no, I did not mean that at all. I mean if there were an isolated outbreak of one disease or the other. I would take it, from the answers to my previous questions, that since foot and mouth disease is more contagious, more easily carried from place to place inadvertently, other things being equal the inference is with a new isolated outbreak in some new place entirely statistically, for that reason, it would be more liable to be foot and mouth disease than stomatitis?—A. Well, there is the possibility.

Q. Do you feel, doctor, that if you were a practising veterinarian that you could definitely diagnose—if you had an animal with any of these symptoms—do you suppose you could definitely diagnose the disease from the symptoms alone?—A. Vesicular stomatitis?

Q. You do not know which you have?—A. Or foot and mouth disease?

Q. One or the other—you do not know which. Could you say with certainty that it was one or the other?—A. It would depend largely upon the circumstances. We will go back now to this particular outbreak. We have established beyond doubt that we are dealing with foot and mouth disease. All right.

A new herd of cattle over here belonging to John Jones develops the same set of clinical symptoms as has been shown in the cases which have been diagnosed as foot and mouth disease. I would have no hesitation on clinical examination in putting that herd into the ground—because we have established that the infection is there.

Q. If there is a new outbreak, a fresh outbreak entirely, completely unconnected as far as anyone can tell with any other disease— —A. You would say down in Ontario?

Q. Yes, but to make clear exactly what I am trying to say it would be better to go back to last November. Had you been on the Waas farm do you feel that you could have identified the disease from the symptoms only had you been called in?—A. Personally? Myself? no.

Q. In that case how would you identify the disease? How or what would be your procedure?—A. Well, there are two methods that you can adopt. If you use the test animal method on the farm you are fairly well assured of excluding or confirming vesicular stomatitis. I think that has been brought out here. If your horse develops lesions you have stomatitis.

Q. Yes, and I know the principle of that; but in order to save time, you feel justified that you would have inoculated other animals or had a laboratory test?

The CHAIRMAN: Your time is up, Mr. MacLean but I will give you another question.

Mr. MACLEAN: Thank you very much. I just have two other brief questions.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. I believe, from what a former witness has said, that there was an outbreak of vesicular stomatitis in the 1930's somewhere in Canada. Have you any knowledge of that?—A. That was in 1938. It was either 1938 or 1939, just prior to the war.

Q. What province was that in?—A. I believe it was in Saskatchewan.

Q. How was it identified?—A. I believe it was identified on clinical examinations and I am quite certain material was forwarded to the lab for confirmation.

Q. Approximately how quickly was it identified?—A. At this moment I am not able to tell you.

Q. My concluding question is: Have any samples been sent to the laboratory in Hull in the last couple of years from individual veterinaries in working for

the provincial government or any veterinaries for the purpose of identifying any vesicular disease?—A. I am not able to answer that for you, sir, as I am not connected with the lab.

Q. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Argue.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Can the witness tell us when the most recent outbreak of foot and mouth disease occurred in Mexico?—A. You mean the last case?

Q. The last case, yes. —A. Well, I believe that they figure the year will be up on the 1st of September—now figure back from then.

Q. The 1st of September 1951 then?—A. No, in 1952—date back.

Mr. CHARLTON: The last case was in 1951.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. That is what I meant. If I did not say it that is what I meant.

I understood Dr. Mitchell this morning to tell the committee that in his opinion when foot and mouth disease appeared in a new country a long distance from its source initially, the disease was always of a mild type. Do you agree with that?—A. Well, I think possibly you misunderstood his answer. I believe Dr. Mitchell was trying to tell you that generally when a disease is introduced into a country—say through merchandise packed in straw, immigrants' clothing, or whatever you had—and now I am speaking about the type A organism—

Q. Yes.—A. ...that it may be very slow in starting; but as it goes along it gains in virulence.

Q. Yes?—A. Now, type A organism has variants and "A" 5 is one of the variants. I believe they now have "A" 6 variant. When you get dealing with variant "A" 5 you have a hot one.

Q. I may be wrong in this but you did not understand Dr. Mitchell this morning to say that if type it were "O" for example or type "C" they would be in a mild form initially?—A. No, I do not believe that is what he meant.

Q. All right. What type of foot and mouth disease have they in Britain now?—A. As far as I am aware they are dealing with "A" but I believe there is some "A" 5.

Q. Now I have another think I wist to raise, Mr. Chairman. I believe that perhaps I might raise it as a question of privilege—it is not a question to the witness.

When I was referring to the Animal Contagious Diseases Act this afternoon, reading section 25 and then reading the opinion of Mr. F. P. Varcoe, deputy attorney general of Canada on the law and the interpretation of that section, I made the statement that if a report from an inspector was not sent directly, as section 5 says it shall be—"with all practical speed to the minister"—then, even on the basis of Mr. Varcoe's interpretation that report must be sent to the minister or, in his interpretation it could go through the regular departmental channels. Then Mr. Stewart interrupted me to say that the Interpretation Act was such that if the report was made to the office of the veterinary director general that was complying with the Act.

Mr. STEWART: On a point of privilege, I did not say anything of the sort. I said to the deputy minister.

Mr. ARGUE: I understood the member—

Mr. STEWART: You cannot misquote me and don't misunderstand—

Mr. ARGUE: That is right, you interrupted and said that if I knew anything about the Interpretation Act I would know so and so.

Mr. STEWART: Yes.

Mr. ARGUE: I will read the section of the Interpretation Act—section 31 (1) and the heading of the column is “Ministers and Deputies”.

... words directing or empowering a ministering of the Crown to do any act or thing, or otherwise applying to him by his name of office, include a minister acting for, or, if the office is vacant, in the place of such minister, under the authority of an order in council, and also his successors in such office, and his or their lawful deputy;

So, the report must be made, according to the Interpretation Act, to the minister or to the deputy.

Mr. STEWART: Yes.

Mr. ARGUE: But the report was not made to either the Minister of Agriculture or the deputy minister.

Mr. STEWART: And the deputy was not mentioned.

Mr. ARGUE: Not mentioned here at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wood.

By Mr. Wood:

Q. I understand before dinner that you made the statement to us that we had an outbreak of vesicular stomatitis in 1939. Is that so?—A. 1938 or 1939, I believe it was.

Q. Could you tell us where that outbreak was?—A. I believe it was in the province of Saskatchewan.

Q. I was just wondering if there might possibly be any connection between that outbreak of stomatitis in 1938 or 1939 and the present outbreak?—A. I do not think there is a possibility whatever.

Q. Was the laboratory at Hull used in the 1938 outbreak of stomatitis?—A. In 1938 and 1939 I believe that some specimens were forwarded to the laboratory.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, there was one question I wished to direct to the minister before questioning Dr. Hall.

Was one of the purposes of the construction or enlargement of the laboratories in Hull by the joint efforts of Canadians and Americans to establish a laboratory in this country where quick determination could be made if virus or germ warfare were used during the war by the enemy?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I will have to check the records a little further because I am told there was no American money put into the Hull plant. The money that was put into a plant during that time was put into the one down on the island in the St. Lawrence. Now, that of course does change the picture slightly from what was said this morning so I would rather not comment on what the position is.

However, while I am on my feet I would like to ask a question following up the question asked a moment ago, about there being stomatitis in Saskatchewan in 1938? I would just like to ask the witness—and he may not know the answer to the question and if he does not well and good—but have we any idea of where that came from?

The WITNESS: Not the faintest.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Was it not Montana?

The WITNESS: Well it may have been, I am not prepared to say.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I think the records will show that.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Dr. Hall, have you got a copy of the notice alerting the inspectors at the ports of entry with regard to the fact that there had been severe outbreaks in Europe—advising them to take additional care?—A. I have not that here.

Q. Could you have that filed with the committee?

A moment ago you stated that the present outbreak did not or obviously had not spread rapidly—at least that is what I understood you to say. From the evidence we have had here in these reports it seems to me everybody that contacted those herds immediately seemed to have the disease in their own herds.

There were two people who visited the Waas herd and helped to administer medicines. Immediately their herds broke out. Evidence has since been adduced that a certain man worked for Waas and then worked for Mr. Hanley I believe it was, and a number of herds. Immediately the thing spread. Just why do you make the statement that obviously this did not spread rapidly?—A. I made the statement because it is quite obvious, sir, that you had infection there early in December. Possibly you had it there in November.

Q. November 25th or 27th?—A. The 26th or whatever it was. Now, even up to this date it has only spread to a small number of premises in the quarantined area. Had that all taken place in the course of a week or ten days, then it would have been a hot spread—but it has spread slowly.

I feel this, and this is only my own observation and you can take it for what it is worth, that as the virus goes on, if we were not putting these animals under the ground or there was loose virus, as it goes on its virulency will increase and it becomes hot—then it will spread and it will spread the same way as it spreads in Europe.

Q. That is a reasonable answer to the question. I wondered just why you made that statement with regard to the quarantine. Can you tell us the regulations that are issued to the people who make a quarantine, as to how that shall be carried out, first, with regard to vesicular stomatitis, and then with regard to foot and mouth disease, so that we will know the difference, and know how thorough your regulations are with regard to quarantine.—A. Well, your thought at the moment—you are dealing with the individual quarantine on the man's farm?

Q. That first, and then the over-all quarantine, within the quarantined area, and then in the buffer zone. We want to get a complete picture of what is being done so that the committee may have an idea as to the thoroughness of the quarantine, both on the individual farm, in the quarantined area and in the buffer zone.—A. May I suggest to you, sir, that we have Dr. Wells, who has just come from Regina and has been in this area, and deals with this. He can give you more information as to just what is going on there than I possibly can.

Q. It was stated yesterday that rats took this disease. To your knowledge, is that a fact?—A. That what?

Q. That rats are subject to this disease. Will rats take the disease themselves? Are there cases known where rats themselves took the disease?—A. You will have to ask the scientific man. I do not know of any.

Q. You do not know of it?—A. No.

Q. I understood yesterday that that was stated here.—A. Are you sure now that you have not got that confused with guinea pigs?

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, did you not make that statement?

The CHAIRMAN: I think the record will show that I understood that rats were susceptible to the disease.

Mr. DECORE: Carriers.

The CHAIRMAN: No, I am pretty sure I said susceptible.

Mr. WRIGHT: Then if that is correct, that rats are subject to the disease as well as being carriers of the disease, they would be carriers of the disease, would they not?

The WITNESS: I would say that they could in a modified way be a mechanical carrier, but you have to show me a rat with foot and mouth disease.

Mr. WRIGHT: All that I am going by is the answers that were given by one of the witnesses yesterday to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Just to keep the record straight I will read the questions:

By the Chairman:

Q. I understand that rats are very susceptible to foot and mouth disease. Is that correct?—A. That is right.

Mr. ARGUE: Who was the witness at that point?

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. James. The next question I asked is:

Q. And is the quarantined area an area which you would say was highly infested with rats?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. On the basis of those answers given yesterday, I am asking Dr. Wells if his department has carried on any campaign to eradicate rats in the quarantined area?—A. Now, you said "Dr. Wells". I do not happen to be Wells.

Q. Dr. Hall—you will pardon me, we are talking about so many names.—A. You can ask Dr. Wells. He will be here.

Q. No, I am asking you.—A. I do not know. I have never met with any.

Q. You never heard of any issued from your department?—A. Remember, foot and mouth disease is a disease of cloven-footed animals, cattle, sheep, goats, hogs. Well, I fail to find a rat that was cloven-hoofed.

Q. That certainly came to me as a surprise yesterday when the witness gave the answer that he did, but that answer being on the record, you can hardly blame a member of the committee for wanting to get some more information with regard to it, knowing that rats were prevalent in that area. You do not think, then, sir, that rats are dangerous as mechanical carriers of the disease?—A. I would not go so far as to say that a rat would not carry infection mechanically. I think it is rather remote myself. It is a possibility but it is highly improbable.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Decore, you have the floor, and then Mr. Quelch.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. Dr. Hall, I should like to ask you for an expression of opinion. Yesterday Dr. Carlson in his evidence made a statement to the effect that the delay of the diagnosis of this disease had very little to do with the spread of the disease around Regina. Now, would you care to express your opinion whether you agree or disagree with that statement. Remember, Dr. Carlson was right in the field there and his statement is to the effect that a delay in diagnosis of this disease had very little to do with the spreading of the disease around the Regina area. Would you agree with that?—A. I can only make an observation. I have told this committee time and time again that we were dealing with a benign type of infection and you can go back to the Wass premises, so far as I am aware at the moment—and I stand for correction—and there there were only two herds that became infected at the same time in the Wass area. There were only three herds in there, I believe, but I stand for correction. Well, it did not spread rapidly from those three herds, that is, the neighbouring herds were not affected.

Q. So then you agree with the statement made?—A. I am not going to say that I entirely agree, but that is an observation. We were dealing with a benign type of organism and I am telling you, and will keep repeating it, that as it goes on it will become hotter.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. When Mr. MacLean asked you whether it was possible to make a fairly satisfactory diagnosis in the field as between vesicular stomatitis and the foot and mouth disease, I think you said it would be possible by a test on animals, did you not?—A. Well, it is recognized that if you have vesicular stomatitis you can pass that infection to horses, but you cannot pass any other vesicular disease that I know of.

Q. In the case of the Waas herd, that was done, in the case of two horses that were inoculated and they both contracted vesicular stomatitis, one a severe case and one a minor case. How, then, do you account for the fact apparently those cattle had foot and mouth disease and yet the tests showed that they had vesicular stomatitis and still further misled the veterinarians?—A. I believe if you go back on the record here, that Mr. Mitchell, who is a pathologist and works with those things, made an explanation here in the record as to why that happens. I would rather not go into the details of that because he is a pathologist of outstanding reputation and I think he told you that if the animal had the stomatitis organism in the body that you would get a little reaction at that time, although I am not going to labour that point because I am not capable of doing it.

Q. He also suggested that it should have been done by a hypodermic?—A. Well, that is a matter of opinion.

Q. Was there much reliance placed on that test? Did that have very much effect upon the opinions of your staff?—A. I believe it did.

Q. And yet you must have known at the time what Dr. Mitchell said was true, or were you aware of that fact at the time that horse, taken from within the Waas herd, could not really be relied upon due to the fact that it might already have had the virus?—A. That is a technical point and I am not going to labour it.

Q. Did I understand you to say, as did the answer yesterday, that rats were susceptible to foot and mouth disease; in other words, can rats contract the disease or are they only carriers?—A. Well, I think the impression that was conveyed here yesterday was that rats actually contracted foot and mouth disease. It is only cloven-footed animals that contract the disease. I must say that I would like to see a rat with foot and mouth disease.

Q. You would say they would act as carriers?—A. They would act mildly as mechanical carriers.

Q. Do we allow the importation of cattle from countries that attempt to control foot and mouth diseases by vaccination instead of by slaughtering?—A. No, sir.

Q. Not at all?—A. Not at all.

Q. How was it done in Mexico, by vaccination or slaughter?—A. They started it first by slaughter. I do not care to labour this too greatly—the Mexicans are not Canadians. They tried the slaughter policy there, but the infection spread so rapidly that they had to give that policy up largely, and even though they did adopt a vaccination policy, they still carried out the slaughter policy in a mild form.

Q. The embargo against Mexico has been lifted, has it not?—A. No.

Q. It is still on?—A. Yes.

Q. I am glad to hear that. Are we allowing cattle in from England?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are we allowing cattle in from Scotland?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has the disease broken out in Scotland now?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. HETLAND: I read that article yesterday in the magazine that the chairman has. It was written by a farm correspondent. That is the reason I did not ask that question yesterday. Probably it is not authentic, whether the doctor yesterday just included with the deer all the other.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not mention deer.

Mr. HETLAND: Maybe not, but that is what is mentioned there. We asked Dr. Mitchell whether a rat would carry foot and mouth disease. That is not authentic as far as I was concerned.

By Mr. MacKenzie:

Q. My question is a minor one, and it probably has been asked and answered before. The press has given quite a lot of publicity to the theory that this immigrant boy Willi had carried the disease in the opinion of your branch. Have you any evidence to lead to that belief, or is it partly because he worked around the place where the disease was first introduced into this district?—A. Well, I will put it to you this way. Here we have a country, Canada, that was free from foot and mouth disease. It never existed in this country so far as I am aware. There are some people who would lead you to believe that early in 1867 or something like that there was foot and mouth disease in this country, but I have not been able to check that conclusively.

Now, all right, to go on from that. We have had a clean country, free from foot and mouth disease. Then suddenly we have a man who originated from an infected farm in Germany who seventeen days later was on a farm at McLean, Saskatchewan. Now, we do know—

Mr. MURRAY: Would the speaker turn this way so we can all hear?

The WITNESS: We do know that the human is a carrier and can carry the infection. It happened, I believe, in the case of Waas where the two neighbours helped drench the cattle and then carried it home to their own herds.

Now, I am not prepared to state conclusively that this was actually the source of infection and I do not think any other man could, but there are the circumstances and what that source of infection is, sir, is obvious to you.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Coming back to the rat business, we had a doctor here yesterday who said that the rat would take foot and mouth disease and it could be a carrier the same as you have explained a human being would carry it. You have said it is not possible and you ridicule the idea. Well, those are two veterinarian surgeons' opinions, one against the other. In this magazine which the chairman has produced the article says that Britain has found that out recently. Now, I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that you make arrangements through the committee that we get in touch with Britain—we can get anything back in a couple of days—and ask them what research they have done and if they can really carry the disease or take it. They may not be able to take the disease but are still carriers of the disease because I can imagine a rat getting a bone and carrying the marrow away and getting into a feed trough that animals with the cloven hoof would be feeding in and it would be quite possible. You refer to a man's clothes, so it is just as possible for a rat to carry it as a man's clothes.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Might I say this? I naturally get letters from all over the country now telling us how to fight the foot and mouth disease.

Mr. BRYCE: Don't put me in that class; I am not trying to tell you.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, but I have a number of letters from men who have had experience in Britain and right at the very beginning when we were burying these animals a chap I knew—I have known him for quite a number of years—an English chap who lives in Alberta wrote me to ask whether we were burying these animals in lime. He went on to say that the reason they buried them in lime when he was in Britain—he told me of his experience in fighting it in Britain and yet to my knowledge he has been in this country twenty-five or thirty years, so it must have been away back when he was fighting it in Britain—and the reason he said or one of the reasons they buried an animal in lime was that they would be eaten up and one of the reasons for that was that when they did not do that the rats dug down into the hole where the cattle were buried and did, at least in their way of thinking—in his way of thinking, certainly—assist in carrying the disease.

Now, I have had that conveyed to me by letter from quite a number of people. No doubt someone conveyed the same idea to the man who wrote this article.

Mr. BRYCE: Well, you remember, Mr. Minister, when you came back from Saskatchewan in conversation I asked you if they were really doing that because they did it in the old country to my knowledge.

Mr. WRIGHT: There would be no harm, though, in inquiring from the British authorities if they had any new information.

Mr. QUELCH: Well, couldn't they find out from Hull whether a rat could take foot and mouth disease by testing one?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, whether he carries it is the important thing, not whether he takes it.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for Dr. Hall?

Mr. SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get your eye since ten minutes after eight and I would ask you very kindly to look this way once in a while too.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. I have just one question, Dr. Hall. You say that there is this type A, A-5, type C and type O. Now, just tell us how type A affects cattle, A-5, C and O, and which is the most dangerous?—A. Now, you are getting me into the scientific field and I am not capable of giving you the details, but roughly it is this, that your type C is a hot virus, it spreads rapidly, the mortality, I believe, is higher. You will get a higher death rate from the C type than you will from the plain A type unless it is the A-5 type which might compare with it and I use the word "might."

By Mr. Murray:

Q. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if cattle in the northern areas are not more immune to this disease than further south? I would also point out that there are no rats in Alberta, certainly none in the Peace River country.—A. You, sir, are going on the theory that the further north you are the more immune you are to the virus of foot and mouth disease. Now, I believe that some years ago that was an explanation that was given in connection with outbreaks in Great Britain in that England, the south of England, would have outbreaks and maybe places a little farther north and Scotland remained free. But it now happens that Scotland has an outbreak.

Now, whether the cold climate has a detrimental effect on it, I am not prepared to say definitely. The fact of the matter is we have it in Saskatchewan, which is pretty far north.

Q. Mr. Chairman, the breeders in Texas have been sending up to the Peace River country for foundation stock. This has been stopped temporarily by the embargo but purebred cattle have been moving south in large numbers.—A. I am sorry, I do not catch your question, sir.

Q. Well, I pointed out that cattle breeders in Texas and Oklahoma and the south have been sending to points north of Edmonton for breeding stock for purebred cattle, registered stock, apparently believing that they were more immune to these maladies and that they were more verile for the ranges.—A. Well, my only answer to that question is that Canada holds an enviable position so far as the health of her livestock is concerned.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. Is there any indication as yet, is there any case of any wild life having contracted foot and mouth disease—deer or antelope or anything of that kind?—A. There is no case of wild life in this outbreak that I know of.

Q. And presumably gophers and other small animals would carry the disease the same as rats?—A. Only as a mechanical carrier, the same as a man who is a mechanical carrier, but not to the same extent.

Q. Are there any types of cattle, for instance, perhaps Brahman cattle which might be immune to foot and mouth disease?—A. I know of none.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions of Dr. Hall?

Mr. SINNOTT: I would like to just thank Dr. Hall very very much for his information.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Hall. We have I think, Dr. Wells with us, the next witness.

Dr. K. F. Wells, called:

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we have with us Dr. K. F. Wells, the Chief Veterinarian, Contagious Diseases section of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, before he begins his evidence I notice here in the documents in sessional paper 169-F a message from Dr. Wells to the Veterinary Director General saying that:

“Under separate cover we are forwarding a map of the province of Saskatchewan showing in red all infected premises.”

Have we got that map here?

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in reply to the first question I have not the map here or a copy of the map I forwarded to Dr. Childs, but I have a similar map here and it will be a matter of two minutes for me to take a red pencil and mark it up. Do you wish it done now?

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest so in case it is wanted. If it will only take two minutes you had better do it.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. If you have a statement to make like the other witnesses you could carry on, then.—A. It will be understood, of course, that these will be approximate locations.

Q. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish the witness to do that now. I thought if he had a preliminary statement to make he could do that first. If you will call them out we will mark them down as you call them.—A. Well, I can call you out the land locations, but it will take half an hour or longer. Generally speaking, sir, the majority of them start at Regina and swing northwest in a

semi-circle up to the upper left-hand corner of municipality 159. There are two at Truax, quite close to the village of Truax in rural municipality 100. That is in the centre of 100 on the east side. There are two in the northeast corner of number 71, and there are 7 in the rural municipality of number 67. Now, that is very close.

Mr. BROWNE: How many is that altogether?

Mr. WHITMAN: How many in number 67, Doctor Wells? Seven?

The WITNESS: Yes, seven.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Are these actually infected herds, or do these include contacts?—A. These include all contact herds.

Q. That is, only about 11 herds, then?—A. I did not mention the number in the Regina district.

Q. I see; you mean within a few miles of Regina?—A. Yes; there are 23 in Regina, and moving up northwest towards Lumsden.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Seven of them are in Regina city.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you going to make a short statement?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Please give your qualifications and how long you have been with the service, so that they will know who you are.

Order, please!

The WITNESS: I have been asked by the chairman first of all to give my qualifications and my position. I am a graduate veterinary from the Ontario Veterinary College, in 1938. Then I lectured for one year in the Agricultural Faculty of Macdonald College in Ste. Anne de Bellevue; and then I joined the federal service in Hull, in 1939. My present position is chief veterinarian, Health of Animals division, in the Dominion Department of Agriculture.

My first connection with the present outbreak of foot and mouth disease was on February 17, 1952, when I accompanied Dr. Childs, the veterinary director-general, from Ottawa to the city of Regina.

The diagnosis had not at that time been made. Dr. Childs returned to Ottawa and left me stationed at Regina. Prior to the actual diagnosis being made, a general quarantine was issued on a number of municipalities surrounding Regina, 11, to be exact. That was the original quarantine.

This general quarantine provided, in brief, that no livestock or livestock products could be moved within that quarantine area, or from within to without that quarantine area without a permit from an officer of the Health of Animals division. This included, of course, not only livestock itself, but also hides, hooves, horns, milk, and all other products of livestock, including meat of course.

The purpose of the general quarantine is simply this, that if it were possible in any disease control to establish a perfect quarantine, then your outbreak would be over because the disease would not be able to spread, once the active infection has been disposed of. So it was on that basis that the quarantine was operated.

Permits were not given for anything at the start of the outbreak until the extent of the infection had been ascertained. When that extent had been ascertained, permits were given, not under any general rule but according to specific instances, so I cannot list any general criteria which would cover the issuance of permits for the movement of livestock. I can say, however, that livestock itself was not permitted to move. And cereal grain permits were not issued for the movement of cereal grain.

Shortly after an assessment of the extent of the outbreak, permits were given for the movement of hides into hide handling establishments where proper disinfectant facilities for hides had been set up.

Now, sir, I believe that generally covers the quarantine. Do you want me to carry on with the actions from there?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you please.

The WITNESS: Just previous to the actual diagnosis being announced, owing to a strong suspicion that existed just previous to that time, we made arrangements for the necessary staff and equipment to go ahead and start on an eradication policy, should the diagnosis prove to be positive. So arrangements were made first of all for rubber equipment. One may wonder why veterinarians wear rubber equipment, such as rubber hats, coats, boots, and coveralls. The reason is that ordinary disinfectants are of no value in killing the virus of foot and mouth disease so we have to use a 2 per cent lye solution, and as you know, rubber is the only thing which will stand continual washing with a lye solution. Arrangements were also made for the getting together of the necessary digging equipment in order to dig holes to bury any infected or contact cattle.

Arrangements were made with the Dominion Livestock division in Regina for the appraisal of those cattle. Therefore, on February 25, when the diagnosis was made, we started in on a Monday to dig our first hole and to appraise our first cattle.

Previous to my arrival, the veterinarians in Regina had quarantined a great many of these infected herds, and it was because of this quarantine previous to the suspicion that the outbreak was foot and mouth disease that the infection did not spread beyond its present limits in the vicinity of Regina.

These herds were quarantined on the order of the veterinary director-general and that is one of the main reasons why the outbreak is limited to its present extent. We had all of these premises quarantined and we knew which ones they were, and orders for slaughter were written on them, and as quickly as weather conditions permitted, we proceeded to dig holes and bury the cattle.

The first hole was finished on February 29. We started digging that hole on a Monday night and digging arrangements were under the supervision of Dr. L. B. Thomson, director of the P.F.R.A. in Regina. He and his engineers handled that end of it because we, as veterinarians, were not familiar with digging this type of hole.

It took 60 hours to dig that first hole, because of the frost which was 5½ feet deep; and the equipment continually needed repairs because of the rugged going. It was necessary to use a ribber to break the frost, and it was so cold that when we got out the dirt, we had to use a ribber again to loosen it up in order to put it back in the ground. That was the first hole, on February 29, and cattle from 6 infected premises were put in.

We also had to have prepared a truck, and this is rather important in the case of bringing in cattle which are infected with foot and mouth disease. We had to have a truck especially prepared in order to carry these cattle and to be certain no body material would seep through onto the earth or road below. This truck was built in the P.F.R.A. workshop. We asked for it on a Sunday evening and by Monday noon it was made. It was constructed of ¾" plywood, and the interior was lined with tin, to make sure there would be no leakage of urine or feces.

As I have said, on February 29 the first hole was completed and livestock from 6 infected premises were buried. Then on March the 2nd a second hole was completed and the livestock from 7 infected premises were buried. On March 4, the third hole was completed wherein livestock from 4 infected premises were buried. On March 3—they are just out of order there—the third

hole was completed and livestock from 4 infected premises were buried. On March 4, the fourth hole was completed and in it livestock from 4 infected premises were buried. On March 6, the fifth hole was completed wherein livestock from two infected premises were buried; and on March 7, the sixth hole was completed wherein livestock from 2 infected premises were buried; and on March 11, the seventh and last hole for the initial group of infected cattle in this outbreak to be buried; and there were 4 premises involved at that time. That comprises the initial outbreak, as we now call it, of February 25.

In addition to burying the cattle we had to assess the extent of the infection in the surrounding territory, and that can only be done by bringing in veterinarians and having them visit regularly all these premises surrounding the infected premises. The infection was declared on February 25th which was a Monday, and on Wednesday morning we received our first batch of veterinarians by Trans-Canada Air Lines from Ontario. These men were immediately put to work. We had to obtain transportation for them, but that was done in the city of Regina.

From then on veterinarians have continued to come in as they were necessary to fill replacements, until we had approximately, including Saskatchewan veterinarians, 60 veterinarians working on it, and we have that number working today, in their inspections of surrounding infected premises and in digging up contacts to uncover one more herd in the Regina area and that herd was buried on March 29. From there on we ran into a period of 8 weeks where we had no new infections. Unfortunately it was assumed by the press generally that the outbreak was over. But that is not the case, of course, because of the nature of foot and mouth disease, which is such that it will settle in an area and it will do its "damndest" in that particular area and in all probability the next time it will break out some miles away. So we kept our staff of veterinarians working in larger and larger circles and it was not until about April 20 that we had 2 new infected premises down in the Ormiston municipality, number 71 XL. There an order for slaughter was written on April 22, and the two herds on the premises were destroyed and buried 48 hours later on April 24. The next outbreak occurred on April 29, and that was in the Weyburn district.

Now there has been considerable use of the word "outbreak"; when an infection spreads from one point to another in a district, it is not technically an outbreak, it is merely a spread of the original infection, in all probability arising from contacts which we were not able to uncover at the time, and it has taken that incubation period before clinical symptoms have developed. Such was the case in these two recent breaks in the Weyburn area, on April 29, and within 24 hours we had 4 herds in the ground. By this time the frost had left the ground and we did not run into frost for 4 inches deep, and by getting our digging equipment as soon as we knew of the infection, it was possible to have holes ready within 12 hours.

On May 1st, or April 30th rather, we had two more premises and the animals were buried on May 1st. The last one was on May 3rd, Saturday, last Saturday afternoon; and the inspector came in, one of our veterinarians came in and reported what to him was foot and mouth infection. Our diagnostician went out to the farm and diagnosed. About 9 o'clock Saturday evening. The digging equipment was working on the premises by 10.30 that evening, and by 9 o'clock the next morning the cattle were moving in the hole. It is only by such means that we can get rid of the disease. We must first of all get right to the infected cattle, and that has been our purpose in Regina. That completes the story to date.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any questions for Dr. Wells?

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Mr. Wells, was the matter discussed as to whether it would be advisable to keep the cattle in quarantine, or at least under control, while the frost was coming out of the ground? I mean, as to whether they should be kept in stables and in corrals rather than being allowed to wander around from one farm to the other?—A. Yes sir, that matter was discussed on a number of occasions. You are referring to what was done during the run-off, the spring run-off?

Q. Yes.—A. The spring run-off, and that is tied up again with the question which has been brought up of the Wascana Creek.

Q. That is my next question.—A. We will deal with the two of them together. Wascana Creek and the spring run-off do far more good than harm. Virus, as you are aware, does not multiply outside of living tissue, it must be in living tissue to multiply, and therefore, the only virus available for distribution is that which is actually dropped by cattle. Bacteria on the other hand do multiply outside of live tissue. The only virus available is that virus actually dropped by infected cattle. Where we were taking a herd away, after the cattle were dead we had the premises closely quarantined; and the dilution factor of Wascana Creek was of far more benefit to us than harm in that it prevented the spread of the virus. It works much the same as sewage which goes in the river at one point and 10 miles below another city will take water out of that same river.

Q. You stated a moment ago something about the normal expectation of spread in foot and mouth disease was that it might appear unexpectedly, you might think that you had it under control and all at once it would appear some distance away and nobody would know about how it got there, that it would take a lot of inquiry to find out; but if cattle were wandering around would not this new outbreak become more likely, as it did in Weyburn, before you could take the necessary steps for protection?—A. Yes, that is true, but we generally quarantine the whole municipality. You are talking about the movement of cattle on individual owners premises there. Cattle were not allowed to wander.

Q. Can you supply the committee with your exact instructions about quarantine in the quarantine areas; and, also, could you table with the committee your exact instructions to the people who own infected herds with regard to their movement and the movement of everything on the farm; and then also give us the exact instructions which you issued with regard to the buffer zone, so we will have the full picture—your instructions with regard to quarantine for the whole area.—A. With regard to the instructions concerning all the non-infected premises in the quarantine zone—as to the buffer zones, there are no written or specific instructions given, it was just the general order that cattle, livestock could not be moved without a permit.

Q. What enforcement did you use to see that that was being carried out, was it the mounted police?—A. The mounted police did the enforcement for us. We had a specific detachment under a staff sergeant, 18 mounted policemen, who patrolled all original area of infection, and in addition to that all detachments surrounding the quarantine buffer zone were notified through their officers of this general quarantine and on their normal patrol they assumed as part of their general work the enforcement of this quarantine. They gave us approximately 65 Royal Canadian Mounted Police on 24 hour duty. We discussed the matter with the inspector and he assured us, and we were prepared to believe him, that there was no movement of livestock.

Q. Will you table with the committee the orders for the release of all hides and everything which you stated earlier in your evidence that releases have been issued for within the quarantine area?—A. I can, sir, but it would take a small truck.

Q. You mean that there were so many?—A. You see, when we came into the grain business it was necessary to release shipments of grain and that went on until we felt that the situation in the Regina area was such that we could take grain out of the general quarantine.

Q. I was thinking more of the local things which you carry out; such as hides and meat and things which were actually on the farms in the vicinity; not grain but meat and things in which the virus would live.—A. That would take some time, they would have to be copied in the Regina office.

Q. There are a very large number of them, are there?—A. Not a terrific number of them, it would depend on what you wanted.

Q. From the day you put a general quarantine on?—A. Yes, there would be quite a few cases when we got into the pasture season. Then we had to inspect all the cattle going into pasture, and it was terrific; and then when they started in slaughtering cattle in Regina it was necessary to inspect all the herds before the slaughtered animals left for slaughter and permits had to be given for the release of these animals off their farm to go to the slaughter house. They all had to have permits, because if they did not carry a permit with them they were subject to being stopped by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—they would be stopped in any case, but if they had a permit with them they were permitted to proceed.

Q. Can you give us the numbers of those permits and the type of material—whether it was animals or grain and that sort of thing they were issued for—just the numbers of each that were issued?—A. We would have to get them from Regina, sir.

Q. Yes, but you could have them tabled with the committee so we will have them.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There will be a big list because it will include even meat.

Mr. WRIGHT: The numbers of the releases. I do not want copies of them.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Just give the numbers.

The WITNESS: Fifty permits for cattle, so many for meat and so many—

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, the number of permits that were issued and the purpose for which they were issued. I do not think it is necessary to have it for grain.

Th CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. I have a further question. Did you hear the discussion, Dr. Wells, which went on in the committee with regard to rats?—A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. Could you express your opinion on that—as to whether rats actually can take this disease or not? We have had two differing opinions on it and I would like to have yours?—A. My opinion of the rat business is that rats and guinea pigs are in the same class. They are experimentally infected with the virus—it being injected into them. Guinea pigs are used to help diagnosis of the disease but it must be injected into them in the foot pad with a needle. Rats, not having a cloven hoof are in the same category. Rats do not normally take foot and mouth disease but it could be given to them experimentally. Rats can act as mechanical carriers—that is it is possible but highly improbable because if the rat walked a short distance through grass of any nature or soil of any nature that will clean the rats of virus.

Q. But a rat in the barn that had been scratching and had broken the tissue in his foot, for instance, and got the infection in the broken tissue could take the disease?—A. Yes, it is possible.

Q. You think it is quite improbable?—A. Quite improbable. Rats have not presented a problem to us. We have considered them, of course, and they have not appeared to be so numerous that anything had to be done with them. When these premises are cleaned and disinfected we do not find a great many rats; and our lime and lye solution is reasonably hard on them. I cannot tell you but for all I know there might be ten million rats in Saskatchewan.

Q. There are plenty.—A. We have not run across all of them yet.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott?

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. Dr. Wells, I am sure the information you have given us up to now has been very helpful to the committee—especially what you brought out in regard to Wascana Creek and the spring run-off. I know that many of the members were worried here—especially the member for Souris who thought that was a very big source of infection. I am sure we all—but I am not talking about the member for Souris now—are relieved to know that the spring run-off has helped rather than hindered your efforts.

There are just two or three short questions I would like to ask.

How long have you been with the department?—A. Since the 3rd or the 9th—I forget which—of September 1939.

Q. During this time that you have been with the department—and it is all right for you to sit down—A. I am all right.

Q. ...who were the ones who worked with you in this connection?—A. Generally on the outbreak?

Q. Yes?—A. Generally speaking, sir, the district veterinarian in the province of Saskatchewan, the assistant district veterinarian, Dr. Carlson, and other veterinarians normally in Regina.

Q. When you are talking about veterinarians of the province of Saskatchewan, how many veterinarians have they got, would you know?—A. I have 22 listed here.

Q. All those veterinarians were helping you to eradicate this disease?—A. Not all of those 22 in the Regina area, sir.

During the course of gathering information and the course of eradication we received hundreds of sick calls—what we termed sick calls. People called in from all over the province to say their cattle had foot and mouth disease. Normally we found when we got there that the cow was just trying to have a calf. When those owners call in we must go, and so we have to leave our veterinarians at their stations throughout the province where they normally reside so that we do not have to send a man from Regina out to the district.

We did have a problem of course where anything was sufficiently suspicious following examination by our Health of Animals division man established in the district, if he felt that suspicion was such that it warranted investigation then Dr. Carlson, the gentleman who was here yesterday was our chief diagnostician. He used a small plane with skis in the winter, and wheels now, to take him out on those long distance trips and to get at any suspicious cases. You understand that speed is essential.

Q. I would imagine, doctor, that during this time you had quite a few meetings planning your activities. During those meetings were the provincial veterinarians and the dominion veterinarians all around the same table discussing the same things?—A. Yes—there is only one provincial veterinarian in the province of Saskatchewan and that is Dr. Johnson.

Q. Was he in on all those discussions?—A. Not all of them, but he was in on part of them of course. He was more than welcome and he certainly cooperated very, very closely.

Q. In relation to the department you are working for, who is N.D. Christie? —A. Dr. Christie is district veterinarian in the province of Saskatchewan.

Q. Do you take orders from him?—A. We threshed our problems out together. My position, in so far as position is concerned, is superior to his.

Q. Did I understand you to say that you were provincial? —A. I am with the Health of Animals division of the Department of Agriculture.

Q. He is with—A. He is with the same organization.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jutras.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. If I understood correctly from your remarks, I believe there are three types of quarantine in the area. First, if I may put it this way, you mention the quarantine on the infected premises which was much more severe—more severe than the general quarantine. Would you give us a little more detail on this first type—the infected farm quarantine? Are animals permitted to be removed from an infected farm under any circumstances?—A. No, sir. On the infected farm everyone on the farm is quarantined. During the winter months when the weather was on our side we did not insist that the actual occupants of the farm stay there because they were naturally reluctant to move anywhere, and we had the protection of the snow; but when the snow had left, ever since around the middle of April, on the infected premises, when the quarantine is put on we station one of our men right at the gate. The children cannot go to school and the people on that premises do not go to town for their mail. We do not supply but we arrange for the delivery of mail and groceries and pick up children's books from the schools, and that sort of thing. Now, those people must remain right on that premises, together with all their livestock, until the livestock are buried and the premises are cleansed and disinfected.

Q. In other words, not only does it apply to the livestock but nothing whatsoever can come out of that premises.—A. That is right, sir. That only applied after the snow had gone.

Q. But I am talking of the present time. You can give assurances that there is nothing coming out of those infected premises?—A. We station a man at the gate 24 hours a day.

Q. Then, going on to the other quarantine, the area of general quarantine, what are the restrictions there?—A. It prohibits the movement off individual premises of all livestock or livestock products.

Q. Of all livestock and livestock products?—A. Except under permit, but the owner and the owner's children and the owner's horses can leave the premises because horses are not subject to foot and mouth disease.

Q. They can travel out of that area?—A. Yes, they can travel with their horses and trucks anywhere they wish.

Q. And you allow other things to go out of that area, out of the general area? For instance, can the people in the general area go out of the general area?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they restricted in any way?—A. No.

Q. What about the buffer zone area?—A. The buffer zone is exactly the same, with one distinction. In the buffer zone people can move livestock for immediate slaughter only without a permit.

Q. How do you check that? Do you mean to say they are allowed to move livestock for immediate slaughter only, and that without a permit?—A. That is without a permit, but the movement is only within the buffer zone.

Q. Within the buffer zone?—A. In the quarantine zone, if a man wishes to sell an animal for slaughter, he must have a permit to do so. In the buffer

zone, if the farmer wants to sell an animal, he can truck that beast to a packing plant within the buffer zone without a permit, but it must be going for slaughter if it leaves his zone.

Q. And if he wants to take it out of the buffer zone?—A. He cannot do so.

Q. Under any circumstances.—A. Under any circumstances.

Q. You do not allow the removal of an animal outside that zone?—A. We do in a few circumstances, which would be very, very rare, for instance, where individuals in the buffer zone own pasture land immediately across the buffer line, we would permit them to move their cattle across the buffer line into that pasture, but that pasture then becomes part of the buffer zone.

Q. One last question. In your own mind at the present time, do you feel that the regulations you have in force meet the situation as it should be met?—A. Absolutely, sir.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I would like to ask Dr. Wells what regulations there were governing the movement regarding cattle running at large in the quarantine area about Eastertime. Is there anything to prohibit a farmer turning his cattle out in the morning, letting them run and bringing them in that night, the next day, or sometime later?—A. The provision of the general quarantine prohibits such movement. Now, we know that there were farmers in Saskatchewan who did let their cattle run.

Q. I saw some of them running in that area. I did not know whether it was legal or illegal at the time.—A. You must realize that it is absolutely impossible to police individually every farm in the province of Saskatchewan, or in the buffer zone, and the responsibility for such movement rests entirely upon the owner. He is aware of the regulations and it is not possible for us to police every individual farm.

Mr. WRIGHT: All farmers were supplied with a copy of those regulations?

The WITNESS: It was advertised in the papers and over all the radios.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Was there a community pasture, a part or all of which was in the original quarantined area, opened this spring for livestock?—A. Now, I can give you that in just a moment. To which pasture do you refer?

Q. I am not sure, but is there a new P.F.R.A. pasture in RM-100 or RM-99?—A. There is a P.F.R.A. pasture. It is in both 99 and 100.

Q. Are there cattle in that pasture now?—A. Just a moment and I will tell you. Yes, there are approximately 1,100 cattle in that pasture today.

Q. Was all of it in the quarantine zone when the pasture was open? It is all in the quarantine zone now, but I am not certain if RM-99 was in the original quarantine or not?—A. Yes, they were in the quarantine zone at the time that the pasture was open.

Q. Was that pasture open after the — —A. The Truax infection?

Q. Yes, that is right, because the Truax infection must have been fairly close to that pasture, not many miles away?—A. The Truax infection was somewhere around April 20, April 22, I believe.

Q. Oh, it was earlier than that.—A. Oh, yes, I am sorry, I am thinking of the wrong one. I am thinking of Ormiston. That group of Beingsner and Demerse Brothers, which is the Truax infection were buried on March 4, and the pastures at Caledonia and Ormiston were opened on March 28. There was no further infection there.

We go on the general assumption that the maximum incubation period for foot and mouth disease is three weeks. If we have no further infection in that area within three weeks we are prepared to open that pasture for this reason: if we can get 1,500 or 2,000 cattle in a community pasture you have

them there for three weeks with no infection, those are the safest cattle we have in Saskatchewan because that is the only sound fence in Saskatchewan.

Q. You are probably right about fences. Do you not feel you are taking a considerable risk allowing such a large number of cattle to be congregated within one pasture in case they take the disease?—A. We are taking a risk. On the other hand, we have 1,500 cattle now. If we do not have them in that pasture there are no fences and they will run over the whole country.

Q. There are fences but some of them are not so good?—A. If we use the word loosely, there are some fences.

Q. You are talking about legal fences. I am talking of the fences in the farmer's sense, a couple of wires.—A. Generally speaking, these men have no pasture at home. Now, these cattle must go somewhere. We take a risk. If we let them run we have people down our necks and if we do open a pasture we have another group down our necks. Cattle have to eat and when the cure becomes worse than the disease why then, of course, we have to revamp our ideas and for that reason if we can get clear infection within an area from which cattle are drawn we open a pasture.

To pursue the subject a little bit further, the people in Ormiston are hounding us twenty-four hours a day to open those and we feel that we have yet to wait until a week last Monday before we can feel that those pastures can be safely opened. We have one group of people telling us, "You are crazy because the cattle are running at large," and we have another group telling us, "You are crazy, you should not have them in pasture." They are pretty well spread out. We try to get them in, but it is not altogether possible.

Q. Have you any idea yet as to how the infection spread to Weyburn, the source of the infection there?—A. No, we have not, sir. We are not altogether certain that we have got the truth out of Mike.

Q. The truth out of Mike?—A. Mike Babayar is the owner.

Q. You have not anything you can list as the source of infection there?—A. The only possible source we can list for the time being is that the Saskatchewan mental institute at Weyburn does purchase large quantities of fresh meat, but we have nothing definite.

Q. And Ormiston, as we are aware, it is suspected an order of meat was purchased which originated in the Burns plant and was taken to Ormiston?—A. Yes.

Q. When, doctor, did you first become aware of a vesicular disease in Saskatchewan?—A. That is a difficult question. The thing naturally was discussed to some extent in the office and I was aware that the veterinary director general and assistant veterinary director general were discussing the problem but I had not been brought into it because of my other duties until I accompanied Dr. Childs to Regina on the night of February 16, arriving there on the morning of the 17th.

Q. Up until the night of February 16 you were not at all conversant with the outbreaks up to date?—A. That is right.

Q. Is it your opinion that when a vesicular disease breaks out that the only sure diagnosis is a laboratory diagnosis or an injection of the animals we have had described to us—cattle and hogs and horses?—A. Up until very recent years when a complement fixation test was developed for the virus of foot and mouth disease the only sound test was that of inoculation of animals in the field, which I understand was done in Regina.

Q. But the first time it was known that this disease was foot and mouth disease was as a result of a laboratory test at Hull as we have been given to understand?—A. I believe that is true.

Q. And do you believe the lab tests in Hull are more certain than field tests? Do you think it is advantageous to send samples properly packaged to

the Hull laboratory rather than attempting field tests?—A. Yes, it is advantageous to send them, but not necessarily to establish the disease. It is advantageous to send them to establish the type of virus. We continue to forward specimens now, not to establish the disease but to check and make sure that we are still dealing with the same type of virus; in other words, all our reports to date have indicated type A and when we get further outbreaks—which I tell you we expect—when those come we will forward specimens to assure ourselves that we still have the same type of virus.

Q. You are aware it is foot and mouth disease because of clinical specimens and what you know already?—A. We still know it is foot and mouth disease under the circumstances in this area because the disease is established.

Q. But initially it is the best policy in your opinion, is it not, to forward samples directly, properly packaged to the lab in Hull in order to establish if there is foot and mouth disease?—A. Not necessarily so.

Q. Not necessarily so. What do you mean by that?—A. That the condition can be established by field diagnosis. It was not many years ago—now I cannot give you the actual date, but the complement fixation test—Dr. Mitchell may have given it to you—for the foot and mouth disease in the laboratory is a fairly recent innovation.

Q. You feel a proper field test is equally as good as a laboratory test?—A. Yes, sir, but both of them must be run in conjunction.

Q. Well, that is a little different evidence, I believe, than we had this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: Your time is just about up.

Mr. ARGUE: I have two small questions left.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Would you say, Dr. Wells,—I believe you have already said it, but would you say again that you have had full cooperation from the provincial authorities and the provincial governments in every possible way since you arrived in Regina?—A. We certainly have.

Q. You feel they have done their very best to meet any requests you have made on them?—A. Yes.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I have just one more question and then I will sit down. I am interested in knowing what the reaction is of farmers who have had cattle slaughtered to the compensation which they received. Is it your opinion that they are quite well satisfied with the compensation they received?

The WITNESS: With very, very few exceptions, which I could probably name on less fingers than I have on one hand, they are satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Blue.

By Mr. Blue:

Q. Dr. Wells, you are one of the junior veterinarians of the department, are you not?—A. I do not like to believe that, but I am.

Q. And as a junior man, you are trying to keep pace with all modern advancements in your science, are you not?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you think that anything could have been done better than was done in order to combat this disease?—A. Absolutely not.

Q. Your department, however, was not too familiar with this disease?—A. We had no possible way to be familiar with it.

Q. Do you think that the chief over you did the best thing that could be done to combat this disease under the circumstances?—A. Yes, sir, and if I may say so, with Dr. Childs' permission, arrangements were made this winter, previous to this thing coming up, whereby I was to go to Europe sometime this

summer for the purpose of studying this very disease. All those arrangements had been made in order that we could get more information available, in order to be more prepared. Those arrangements had been made before this thing broke, and I hope they do not figure that I get my experience at home now.

Q. Do you think your chief, Dr. Childs, has been elected as vice-president, and that he may be elected as president of the Livestock Association of the United States by chance, by luck, or by merit?—A. I think it was by merit.

Q. We have had a lot of evidence since this committee began sittings; we have had the deputy minister, Dr. Taggart, Dr. Childs, Dr. James and so on. Was there any meeting which took place between you gentlemen who are giving evidence as to what you should say?—A. I came in on a plane yesterday noon and I have not seen them yet.

Q. Very well. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Hetland.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Dr. Wells, part of a letter was read into the records here the other day by Mr. Wright and I think he tried to leave the impression that it was only a federal responsibility in handling this disease. You said that Dr. Johnson was the provincial veterinarian?—A. That is right.

Q. And you said that he gave you full cooperation?—A. Absolutely.

Q. Dr. Johnson did not take the attitude that it was your baby only, and not his either, and that it was only a federal responsibility and not his own?—A. He was vitally concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Stewart and then Mr. MacLean.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Dr. Wells, because of the apparent difficulty in diagnosing the disease, it has been suggested by Mr. Argue here that any delay thereby resulting has been the cause of our economic plight with respect to the United States markets and so on. Do you believe that this is so?

Mr. ARGUE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I ever said that was the cause of it. I said that it contributed to our economic plight.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. What is your answer on that?—A. The answer is that in so far as our economic problem is concerned, it makes no difference whether you have one premises with foot and mouth disease or a dozen. Let me dig for a moment.

Mr. ARGUE: Or say, 1,200?

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Could you give the committee the reasons for your decision?—A. Let me illustrate. Mr. Waas was the first one to report the infection. That was on December 2. Previous to Mr. Waas reporting this infection, his cattle were sick, on, I believe, November 26; that is the date that is pretty well settled on which those cattle were sick; and if they were sickening, or if they showed clinical evidence of the disease on November 26, then they were disseminating the virus at least 2 days previous to that time because the virus starts to be disseminated when the temperature rises within at least 48 hours ahead of when the vesicles develop. In other words, Mr. Waas' cattle disseminated the virus at least on November 24. Then Mr. Wood, one of his neighbours was infected previous to December 2; that was previous to the date we were notified; and Mr. Smith was infected from the Waas cattle previous to the date we were notified; and Mr. Hanley was infected from them previous to

the date we were notified. Not only that, but at Burns and Co. they were infected previous to the date we were notified. And then Hanley was infected, Clifton, Beingessner and so on; all these people follow Hanley.

Had Hanley reported the disease, which he never did, we could have saved all that list. The point is that there were at least 7 or 8 premises already infected before Mr. Waas notified the Health of Animals division that his cattle were sick. It made little difference to the economic picture, absolutely no difference to the economic picture, whether we had one herd or a dozen herds.

Q. So that the virus was present on this premises before you were aware of it?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And even if it had been diagnosed then as foot and mouth disease the effect would have been the same?—A. Had it been diagnosed on December 2 we would have been in exactly the same economic plight that we are in today.

Q. So the fact is, I take it, that because Mr. William Hanley failed to report there were several additional premises infected?—A. That is right; Murphy, Haun, Duck, Gillis, Stewart and Dosch.

Q. Do you know a Dr. Dosch who assisted Dr. Hewitt, I think he is a Russian?—A. I do not know him personally, sir. I know of him.

Q. That is a man who I think came from Russia?—A. Yes.

Q. And who wanted to be admitted as a veterinarian in Saskatchewan?—A. That is so, yes.

Q. Do you know that he visited a number of herds in Saskatchewan?—A. Yes, he did visit a number of herds and actually in some cases he was the chap who told us, or reported to us, that they had stomatitis.

Q. He diagnosed it as vesicular stomatitis?—A. Stomatitis, that was his report as I understand it. That was previous to my going there.

Q. That was reported to you by a number of officials out there?—A. That is right.

Q. And he had had experience, or claimed to have had experience in Russia with foot and mouth disease?—A. I understand that is true.

Mr. STEWART: All right.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacLean:

By Mr. MacLean (Queens):

Q. You spoke, or referred to the slaughter of cattle on these farms. Do I take it that that means other animals might be carriers, that might have been carrying the virus; such as dogs, horses, hens and so forth?—A. No, sir. We slaughter the cattle, sheep, swine and poultry. Now, we slaughter cattle, sheep and swine because they do get the infection. It is possible to clear up in some cases by washing horses with a 4 per cent sodium bicarbonate solution with a pH of about 12; and pH 12 is sufficient to kill a virus yet it does not hurt horses. Two percent lye solution has pH 14. You can't wash animals with a lye solution. We slaughter cattle, sheep and swine but not chickens. We do not slaughter the chickens because they can get foot and mouth disease, but we slaughter them because it is the only way we can stop them laying eggs. These eggs cannot leave the infected premises, and it would not be fair to the owner to have his chickens piling up eggs. He would be forced into the position of going out to buy his eggs and we would need to compensate him for them, so it is easier to let him keep them under strict control.

Q. And for some reason it does not affect cats or dogs?—A. Cats and dogs can be washed with sodium carbonate. I might explain that in one or two instances we did destroy dogs but that was only at the specific request of the owner who was given clearly to understand that it was not necessary.

Q. How long will the virus of foot and mouth disease stay alive in frozen ground? I understand that the virus will stay alive for some time when it is frozen, say in the ground all winter, and that it is still possible that it may infect cattle in the spring.—A. Yes, that is true, the virus of foot and mouth disease solidly frozen will live for years.

Q. And it will not live any considerable length of time when exposed to the sunlight?—A. That is so, direct sunlight will destroy it.

Q. But it will live in buildings and hay and straw and that sort of thing?—A. Yes, it will live in buildings, in straw and hay. The last report that I have had on the subject is 347 or 357 days, I am not just certain, but it is close to a year.

Q. I understand that it was only type A foot and mouth disease that came to your notice in Saskatchewan?—A. All reports to Dr. Mitchell have stated that it was type A.

Q. Now, in what places in the world are there epidemics of type "A" foot and mouth disease at the present time—or were there last November?—A. I cannot tell you exactly, sir, but in generalities I would say every country in the world except Australia, New Zealand, the United States and Canada.

Q. What I mean was generally in Great Britain, Europe, and so on they have that type "A"?—A. Yes.

Q. And perhaps other types as well?—A. They have type "A", yes, sir.

Q. Is it possible for cattle to have both foot and mouth disease and vesicular stomatitis at the same time?—A. I would imagine so.

Q. In that case would it be possible to prove that situation by infecting other animals? Or would one disease kill the other as far as tests are concerned?—A. Well, the virus of stomatitis would leave quite readily over the long period and you would have left foot and mouth disease.

Q. What I mean is that supposing there is a sick animal and it should happen to be an animal that had both diseases—and if you have done injections on other animals with virus from this cow or sheep—as a matter of fact if you injected the horse or guinea pig or whatever it was with both diseases would the results show the cow had both diseases?—A. I do not like to be facetious but it is something which to my mind I can hardly imagine arising; and I think it would be in the position of the Englishman who said: "You pays your money and you takes your chance."

Q. That is exactly what I am getting at. If someone wanted, with malice, to infect cattle with foot and mouth disease the smart thing to do would be to infect them with both diseases and make diagnosis more difficult?—A. Yes, sir, that is very true.

Q. I think that's all.—A. May I bring out one point. Here in the initial case on the Waas premises, and again this is as I understand it from our records, the infection was very, very mild. I have somewhere here if I can find it a record of the infection on the Kivol premises. Here it is.

On the original outbreak on the Waas premises the infection was very, very mild. I heard, I believe it was Dr. Hall ahead of me, speak of the business of the virus building up. They build up through animal passage—as they go from one animal to the other they can either get more virulent or less virulent.

When the cattle taken from the Kivol farm at Ormston were put in the pit we did a post mortem on every one.

A cow of seven years had extensive tongue lesions, all four feet were vesicular. In a cow seven years—tongue lesions, medium, all four feet vesicular, with some hoof separation. A cow four years, dental pad lesion, tongue extensive, two hind feet vesicular. In a heifer three years old tongue, healed lesions on tip, one foot lesion. In a cow five years old tongue extensive,

no foot lesions. In a heifer two years old tongue extensive near recovered, one front foot vesicular, two hind feet vesicular, two hind feet hoof separation—that is the hoof eventually separates entirely from the foot.

In a heifer one year, the tongue showed slight lesions, three feet vesicular, one front foot clear. In a yearling bull, extensive tongue lesions, two hind feet vesicular. In a heifer one month, tongue medium lesions, two front feet vesicular, one hind foot vesicular. In a bull one month tongue slight, four feet vesicular. In a steer two years tongue extensive, two hind feet vesicular, one front foot vesicular.

In a sow—and this is most important—in a sow on that premises no lesions on the tongue—and that is not to be wondered at in a sow—but four fet had extensive lesions, four feet were showing hoof separation and the sow had aborted about ten days previous.

Now I tell you, sir, had the evidence on the Waas premises been as I have read you from the Kivol premises it would have been diagnosed as foot and mouth disease on the first day; but the evidence was nowhere near like that. This virus has become more virulent. I realize that, but if it was possible that in the original case animals had both diseases at the same time, the only sure way you could determine that would be by laboratory tests?—A. I would imagine so, and I do not quite see at the moment how he would sort them out.

Q. Are you satisfied in your own mind that there was no case of vesicular stomatitis? Are you convinced, or has it been proven that this disease in every case was foot and mouth disease?—A. I must repeat, sir, that my first visit to Regina in connection with this was on February 17, and I am not conversant with the individual herds previous to that. All of our specimens taken have been positive to foot and mouth disease.

Mr. ARGUE: Ten o'clock. I move we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN: Could we finish with Dr. Wells tonight? Is that possible?

Mr. BROWNE: I have a few questions only.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: This is the most important man in the field there, and he is the man who is carrying on all the activities.

Mr. ARGUE: Just a point of information. Would it delay Dr. Wells' return trip to Regina if we had a committee meeting at eleven in the morning?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There is a meeting tomorrow at eleven which makes that impossible, but if we could finish tonight it would be most helpful. As a matter of fact, we are having difficulties with some of our other men, as to being able to use them any longer.

Mr. ARGUE: Would that speed Dr. Wells' return to Regina? What I mean is when is the next plane he can get?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: If we can finish tonight it would speed it, but if we cannot—

The CHAIRMAN: It would be four o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. STEWART: If he finishes tonight he can get a plane tonight.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: We can get a plane for him at any time. The other night we wanted to send a man to British Columbia in connection with this disease. They told us there was no space on the plane. I telephoned Montreal and in five minutes I had a space. They will put anybody off this plane. Most of the people travelling, or a good many of them, are government employees anyway, and they can take one off and put on another, and he can go tonight any time there is a plane going.

Agreed.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Doctor, how many places are under quarantine at the present time?
—A. How many farms?

Q. Yes.—A. There are 41 premises from which livestock have been destroyed.

Q. Are they under quarantine still?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What does that mean, that no cattle, no people are allowed in there?
—A. Yes, people are allowed in and off, but no livestock are allowed in or off the premises.

Q. Now, how many outbreaks have there been to date?—A. There has been one outbreak to date.

Q. Well, as they use the term in England I understand that if it appears in another place it is called another outbreak?—A. Of those 41—

Q. What do you call it when it spreads to another locality?—A. Of those 41 infected premises in the present outbreak of foot and mouth disease, 30 had infected cattle on them and 11 were contact premises; in other words, in 11 of them we did not find clinical evidence of disease but they were destroyed because of direct contact with infected cattle.

Q. How many of them do you say or did you say a few moments ago were infected before December 3?—A. I think it was six but I had just better check it and make certain—yes, six.

Q. Making 35 others that became infected afterwards?—A. There are only 30 infected, sir.

Q. Then, there are 24?—A. Yes.

Q. I notice that Dr. James put a quarantine on; the quarantine which he put on was not the same quarantine you are speaking of as existing at the present time?—A. No, the quarantine existing at the present time is an order of slaughter.

Q. It is a ministerial order?—A. No, it is not, sir.

Q. Is it just put on by you or other veterinarians?—A. Yes.

Q. Isn't there also a ministerial order of quarantine that is authorized?—A. On the whole of the area, sir. All this area marked in red is under a general quarantine under the authority of a ministerial order.

Q. What do you call that zone?—A. That is the quarantine zone.

Q. When Dr. James put a quarantine on Waas' premises on December 3, what would you call that quarantine?—A. That was just a straight individual quarantine of those individual premises.

Q. What did it mean?—A. It meant that no cattle or sheep or swine were allowed to leave those premises until that quarantine was lifted.

Q. He took that off on December 8?—A. So I understand.

Q. Well, he should have really kept it on longer, shouldn't he?—A. I do not know, sir.

Q. You have it on now, have you not?—A. We have an order to slaughter on now.

Q. Isn't that premises still quarantined?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, if you had determined by laboratory test early in December that this was foot and mouth disease, that quarantine would not have been lifted, would it?—A. Yes, that is right.

Q. And the same thing applies to Woods' and Smith's places?—A. That is right, yes, but in the meantime it was on six premises previous to December 2 when we were notified and one of those premises was Mr. Hanley's. Now, Mr. Hanley never did report the disease to us and it spread from Mr. Hanley's premises to seven others.

Q. Now, is Mr. Hanley supposed to report diseases?—A. Yes, he is required to report.

Q. If he realizes what it is, of course?—A. If he realizes it is an infectious or contagious disease.

Q. If it spreads from one cow to another, then it is an infectious disease, is it not?—A. Yes, except that we are only concerned with reportable diseases.

Q. You are concerned with infectious and contagious diseases, are you not?—A. No, we are concerned with diseases which are reportable.

Q. Isn't this under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act?—A. That is right.

Q. Well, what is a contagious disease?—A. The diseases which are reportable under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

Q. Well, what diseases are those?

Mr. SINNOTT: We have had all this already.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am good enough to be a member of this committee and if I am good enough to be a member of this committee I am entitled to ask questions without any slurs.

Mr. SINNOTT: You do not know anything about this disease anyway.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege I ask that the hon. gentleman withdraw that observation.

Mr. SINNOTT: I certainly will not.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman suggested I know nothing about farming. What does he know about farming?

Mr. SINNOTT: You would be surprised. I have got your record.

Mr. STEWART: I do not think the hon. member should be so quick to take offence. I was offended today when he said I did not know any law.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The WITNESS: I think, sir, that I have this for you now. This is the Animal Contagious Diseases Act:

infectious or contagious disease includes, in addition to other diseases generally so designated, glanders, farcy, *maladie du coit*, pleuropneumonia contagiosa, foot and mouth disease, rinderpest, anthrax, Texas fever, hog cholera, swine plague, mange, scab, rabies, tuberculosis, actinomycosis, and variola ovina;

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Mr. Hanley had 180 of his cattle slaughtered, did he not?—A. Oh yes.

Q. Therefore he had one of the largest herds that was infected?—A. I believe that is right, sir.

Q. Has he been prosecuted for not reporting this disease?—A. No sir.

Q. Have there been any prosecutions against anybody for not reporting the disease?—A. No sir.

Q. To whom was he supposed to have reported the disease?—A. To his veterinarian who in turn would report it to the Health of Animals division.

Q. Did he report it to anybody?—A. No sir.

Q. Was he supposed to report it to the Minister?—A. I shall read that section for you.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be quicker if everybody had a copy of the Act.

The WITNESS: This is section 11 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act:

11. (1) Every owner of animals and every breeder of or dealer in animals, and every one bringing animals into Canada, shall, on perceiving the appearance of infectious or contagious disease among the animals owned by him or under his special care, give immediate notice to the Minister and to the nearest veterinary inspector of the Department of Agriculture of the facts discovered by him as aforesaid.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Did any of these men report to the Minister?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Nobody in Canada ever did, so far as I know.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. I am asking the witness. It is the law, is it not, that everyone is supposed to report to the minister when there is an outbreak of disease?—A. I do not know, sir, except that I heard an interpretation of the law which varies with this paragraph.

Q. You read that section, and it is still the law, is it not?—A. Oh yes.

Q. Is it not correct that the veterinarian is responsible to report to the minister under section 25?—A. Yes, a veterinarian.

Q. Let us take this one. At what time did he, Dr. James, report the outbreak on the Waas premises to the minister?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On a point of order. My honourable friend is a lawyer and the gentleman who read from the book is not a lawyer, but I think it reads just the same whoever read it. I think the honourable member for Assiniboia read the interpretation which says that a report to the deputy is the same as a report to me.

Mr. ARGUE: But the deputy did not receive it either.

Mr. BROWNE: The deputy in giving his evidence says that he hadn't heard about it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Don't get personal.

Mr. BROWNE: How could he give evidence about it if you had not heard about it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Under that interpretation I do not necessarily have to hear about it.

Mr. BROWNE: Dr. Wells, I suppose you are familiar with the section to which reference has been made, also with that part of section 25 which requires that the report be made to the minister. Now, whatever the interpretation is that is put on it, does it not mean that you would report directly to him?

Mr. QUELCH: He read it.

Mr. BROWNE: I don't know. What time did you first hear about the disease officially?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order again, let us get this straight. My honourable friend is a lawyer and he knows that with respect to every Act there is what is called an Interpretation Act, and under the Interpretation Act there is the word "minister" and it says that it means that it also includes the deputy minister.

Mr. BROWNE: Of course, I was not questioning that.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Dr. Wells, when did you first get the information about this disease?—A. I think that I have already told you that.

Q. I do not think you stated definitely when you first heard of it, I think it was February 16th; is that right?—A. My first contact with the condition was when I left here to go to Regina in the evening of February 16th.

Q. Yes. Could you tell me now how many reports have been sent in by veterinarians up to February 16th, from December 3rd?—A. I haven't seen them and I have no idea.

Q. You didn't see them up to February 16th, did you?—A. No.

Q. Where were they kept?—A. I do not know.

Q. Have you seen them since?—A. Yes.

Q. Then they must be here some place, reports of what occurred up to the 16th. The reports were sent out, where have they gone to? Where have these reports gone, do you know anything about them?—A. They are on the file in the Health of Animals division.

Q. To whom have they gone?—A. Not to me.

Q. You do not know to whom they went?—A. No.

Q. All right. Now, had these reports been taken more seriously and been referred to the deputy minister or to the minister do you not think that some time would have been gained by having had the clinical examination made which was not made until February 16th.—A. I have not seen the reports, sir; if I were to give you anything it would be an impression, which I do not think you would want.

Q. If this lab examination had been made in Saskatchewan there would have been considerable time saved, would there not?—A. I do not know because I did not see the cattle.

Q. You do not know because you did not see—what?—A. I did not see the cattle.

Q. You did not see the what?—A. The cattle, the livestock.

Q. If laboratory examination had been made earlier there would not have been so much delay?—A. I am not in a position to say.

Q. Why?—A. Well because I didn't see the livestock, sir.

Q. You saw them afterwards though?—A. Yes.

Q. You said that you saw them on February 16, didn't you?—A. Yes.

Q. And you saw them when they were being slaughtered?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, was there any difference between the reports of the livestock up until the time you saw them and what it was on December 3?—A. Yes.

Q. You didn't mention there that latest one, the ones which were slaughtered were bad; what was their condition around February 16?—A. The only thing I can give you is the interpretation I take from what you have already read.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Catherwood.

By Mr. Catherwood:

Q. I have one question, Mr. Chairman, concerning the prevention of the spread of the disease; I understand that there are 65 veterinarians in the field now, 60 or 65?—A. Around 60, sir.

Q. And you started getting them at Regina around February 16, is it your opinion that there are sufficient veterinarians in the field now adequately to prevent the spread of the disease?—A. Yes, sir, we are adequately staffed.

Q. To your knowledge has there been any infraction of the regulations concerning cattle being smuggled outside the proper zones?—A. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Argue.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I believe Dr. Wells told us sometime ago that even if the disease had been diagnosed as foot and mouth at the earliest possible date the country would be in the same economic plight today?—A. In so far as the embargo is concerned.

Q. I do not believe you said that at the time.—A. However, the situation would have been quite similar.

Q. Would have been which?—A. Would have been quite similar—I will stick with that.

Q. You also said there would not be any difference to our economic plight if there had been one or a dozen herds infected?—A. No sir.

Q. Would you say it would not make any difference to our economic plight if there were one or a dozen or 1,200 herds?—A. That would make considerable difference because the cost of handling 1,200 would be considerably greater than handling 12.

Q. The cost of handling 12 is considerably greater than the cost of handling one?—A. In so far as payment of indemnities is concerned—but we would need practically the same staff to handle one case because of the possibilities of more.

Q. With a greater number of herds infected the economic plight of the country would be worse to this extent—that the compensation that the taxpayers of Canada must pay to these farmers through the federal treasury would be increased by that relative amount. Am I correct?—A. Your statement is correct.

Q. So the economic problem would have been more serious as the number of herds infected increased?—A. Yes.

Q. If this disease had been diagnosed as foot and mouth in the very early stages, early in December, is it your opinion that a quarter of beef from an infected carcass would have wound up at Ormiston—with all your quarantine regulations that you have applied since you knew it was foot and mouth disease? If these regulations had been on on say the 10th of December do you think there is a possibility that the disease would not be at Ormiston?—A. There is a distinct possibility it would have been at Ormiston.

Q. There is a distinct possibility it would not have been at Ormiston too, is that not correct?—A. Yes, it is correct either way. I do not know that it is possible to ascertain that.

Q. Well, the Burns plant first showed infection in it on December 18 I believe—that is what it says here: "Cattle sickness first noticed in Burns stockyard December 18."—A. I believe that is right, sir, yes.

Q. Well, then, if the quarantine had been placed on those premises immediately it was ascertained—as quickly as it could be ascertained the disease on the Waas farm was foot and mouth disease—do you not think there would have been a lesser possibility of that quarter of beef getting to Ormiston?—A. I would be guessing, sir, to answer that because I don't really know.

Q. You don't really know. Well, do you agree that because there is infection at Ormiston and this is another herd—you said it did not make any difference whether it was one or twelve herds, and the one at Ormiston may have been about the 25th herd—I do not know if it was but it would be about that—is it your opinion that as the disease is at Ormiston it is causing serious economic plight in so far as the many farmers who use that community pasture are concerned? And I know those farmers personally—because I live right in the district.

You think it increases their economic plight because they have to keep their cattle at home now and a great many of them have no pasture to place their cattle on?

Mr. Chairman, the witness is again being coached.—A. I am not being coached.

Q. I do not think you need to be.—A. This gentleman is not a veterinarian and he is here to provide me with this material which I possibly cannot remember—these dates—Q. Was that anything to do with whether the people in my area are without pasture—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Your question had nothing to do with the statement he made.

Mr. ARGUE: I think in all courtesy to the committee the witness's attention should not be distracted when a member of this committee is posing a question.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. My question was, do you not think it increases the economic plight of the many farmers who ordinarily use the Ormiston pasture because at the present time they have got to keep their cattle at home? Many of them have no pasture and, consequently must provide other means of feeding those animals at an additional expense?—A. I would assume so.

Q. Well then is it your opinion that if this disease, as I hope it will not, continues, and there are a great many herds infected, it would increase the economic plight of our Canadian economy to the extent of greater cost to the taxpayers and the livestock producers of Canada?—A. You have asked for an opinion?

Q. That is correct.—A. And my opinion is this, that the relative difference that one or ten herds would make to the present economic plight of Canada would not be noticeable.

Q. You do not think it would be noticeable if it cost the federal treasury another half a million or another \$10 million?

Mr. STEWART: This witness is not a financial expert. I do not think those questions should be put to him. He is here to give his practical experience to the committee. Why put these questions?

Mr. ARGUE: The witness made the statement.

Mr. STEWART: Not to that extent.

Mr. ARGUE: He said it would not make any difference to our economic plight if there were one or a dozen herds affected.

Mr. STEWART: I do not think that Mr. Argue intends to be unfair to the witness. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You may take your chair, Mr. Argue, while I take the point of order. The point of order is this, that this witness has been called for his practical experience as a veterinarian in the department. Mr. Argue is putting wrong words in the witness's mouth. The witness's statement is, as I heard it, that any effect to our economic plight would be with respect to the United States embargo. He is going much further than that.

Mr. ARGUE: This is the statement the witness made to me a few moments ago. He previously said, as my notes inform me, that it would not make any difference to the economic plight of Canada if there were one or a dozen herds infected. It would not have made any difference to the economic plight of Canada if the disease had been diagnosed in the very earliest stages.

Mr. STEWART: Because you argued that with him. He is not an expert on that.

Mr. ARGUE: He made that statement.

Mr. STEWART: You put the words in his mouth.

Mr. ARGUE: I did not.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You are putting other words in his mouth.

Mr. ARGUE: It struck me, Mr. Chairman, as a most amazing statement from any witness in this committee that the economic plight of Canada would not be worsened by an increased number of infected herds, namely, from one to a dozen, or was not worsened because this disease was not diagnosed in the earliest stages. In great deference to the witness, I submit that that statement is not correct in fact in any way.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On a point of order. My hon. friend says with deference to the witness that statement is not correct.

Mr. ARGUE: In my opinion.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You have now added "in your opinion."

Mr. ARGUE: He said that.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I don't think anyone in this committee or outside recognizes that you are an authority on that point.

Mr. ARGUE: We are both in the same category, both you and I.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I imagine somebody would accept my opinion, but I am not so sure about yours.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness if the sample of the virus of vesicular stomatitis is sent to Hull for test would that test disclose the fact that it was foot and mouth disease if it were foot and mouth disease?—A. If it were tested for foot and mouth disease, yes; if it were not tested for foot and mouth disease, no.

Q. The normal procedure when a sample of the virus of vesicular stomatitis is sent to Hull laboratory would be to make a test for foot and mouth disease too, would it not?—A. I do not know, sir.

Q. You would not know that?—A. No, I do not know, sir.

Q. We would have to call Dr. Mitchell to determine that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the earliest date that any official or other person in the department discussed with you the matter of an outbreak of vesicular stomatitis in Saskatchewan?—A. Oh, I cannot say, sir. I would be guessing if I told you.

Q. Was it long before you went to Saskatchewan? You must have some idea of when this matter was discussed in the department?—A. I really have not.

Q. You have no idea at all?—A. No, I am sorry, sir, I cannot tell you. I was not involved in that work at the time.

Q. But you said a while ago, I believe, that the matter was discussed in the department?—A. Well, I heard about it being discussed. I think that is what I said.

Q. Well, what was the earliest date that you heard about it being discussed in the department?—A. I am sorry, sir, I cannot tell you.

Q. It was not important enough apparently to come to your attention?—A. Yes, it was sufficiently important, sir. I have never indicated that the matter was not sufficiently important.

Q. It was not important enough for you to make any note or to remember it?—A. I was not involved in the situation.

By Mr. Cardiff:

Q. Dr. Wells, could you tell us what difference there was in the effectiveness of the quarantine prior to the diagnosis and after the diagnosis had been taken?—A. I did not get that, sir.

Q. What difference was there in the effectiveness of the quarantine prior to the time the disease was diagnosed and after?—A. Are you speaking, sir, of the general quarantine?

Q. Yes.—A. The general quarantine was placed less than a week in advance of the diagnosis of the disease and there was no difference in the enforcement of that quarantine after it was placed previous to the announcement of foot and mouth disease than after it was announced except the time it took to organize the enforcement.

Q. Well then, I will ask you this question. There was a difference prior to that, perhaps two months before, in December?—A. There was no general quarantine at that time.

Q. There was a quarantine, though?—A. There was individual premises quarantine.

Q. Can you tell me this? Do you know the reason why some men did not report the disease? Was it because of the fact that before the diagnosis was taken they were afraid if they reported their cattle might be seized?—A. I would not know in the first place, not being there, but with the number of these owners who reported the disease themselves I would say that your assumption was wrong, but I do not know.

Q. What was the reason then that this one man who had how many cattle?—A. 180.

Q. Never reported the disease at all? There must have been some reason why he was afraid to report?—A. There are farmers who doctor their own livestock just as there are human beings who prefer a drug store to a medical doctor and he was just one of those chaps who did not use a veterinarian.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Dr. Wells, what is the situation regarding the operation of farms that are actually quarantined? Is it possible for the farmer to complete his operations and to seed his crop?—A. Yes, sir, we make provision for that.

Q. Is he allowed to move his machinery from one quarter section to another, even though it is across the road?—A. Yes sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Sinnott.

Mr. SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have one observation to make before I ask one question, and it refers to the question asked by the member for Assiniboia, and it was done for the purpose of using it in inter-provincial politics.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement. Nothing I said here this evening had anything whatever to do with provincial politics. I believe you should ask, Mr. Chairman, for that statement to be withdrawn. I do not think it is parliamentary for any member to impute motives to any other member and I ask, Mr. Chairman, that you request the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. DECORE: He was right.

Mr. ARGUE: Would you mind giving me a ruling as to whether such a statement is in order or not, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think it is after what has been said here all day. I do not think so. No. You may go ahead.

Mr. SINNOTT: I am referring to the question asked by the member from Assiniboia of Dr. Wells who has been very very frank with his answers; but this specific question was asked of a man who is a qualified veterinarian, and who has nothing to do with the financial situation of the country at all. He was asked a specific question: did he think that it made any difference if this one herd, when first detected, was sent down to the laboratory, or a half a dozen herds. That same question is going to be used in the House in Saskatchewan at every meeting. And I think that the man in question made a statement to the effect that it did not make any difference to the people of Canada whether it was one herd or a dozen.

Mr. ARGUE: Never, never!

Mr. SINNOTT: I am sure that the hon. gentleman who gave his opinion tonight is just as much concerned as to the financial status of any Canadian as are the rest of us here and what he meant certainly was that 6 head of cattle or 60 head of cattle spread over the whole dominion did not mean very much to the whole of Canada; and he is just as much concerned in singling out the district where the first animal was infected, as he was in getting to such a

proportion as this. I know what politics are out in that country, and especially in the province of Saskatchewan; and I just want this put on the record to clear this man's statement, because I know that he meant no harm in making the statement he did.

Mr. ARGUE: I never suggested that he did.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Blue.

Mr. BLUE: Mr. Chairman, I think we have heard a lot of necessary evidence and I think it has been explained to the committee as well as to the Canadian people through the press, and I think they have an understanding of the facts concerning what has taken place, and I think that the best things have been done that could possibly be done under the circumstances. Therefore I move that this committee be now closed and that a report be made to the House of Commons.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): I second the motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROSS: On that point, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. WRIGHT: There have been requests made by a number of people for further witnesses to be called on this matter and I think some witnesses are probably on their way from Saskatchewan with regard to this matter at the present time, or will be very shortly. Dr. Christie I believe is to be called and several of the other people out there, so I for one certainly do not think this committee has reached a point in its discussions yet where we can close our proceedings. That, Mr. Blue, is just my opinion, as one member of this committee.

Mr. BLUE: I have not taken up as much time as many of the members have.

Mr. ARGUE: I certainly think, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Canada would think that we were not fulfilling our duty if we were to close out proceedings at this time.

Mr. BLUE: We are having a lot of questions asked over and over again every day.

Mr. ROSS: I understand that we have a steering committee here, Mr. Chairman; and that at one of these meetings we discussed the various witnesses that should be called before this committee. I think one of those—one of the most important witnesses that we have to hear yet—is Dr. Christie, who has been the chief federal field man located in Regina, and arrangements have been made to bring him here. I am not satisfied that we have done our job here yet. I am not going to argue about whether the Committee should have been called at this particular time or not, but it was called at the instance of the minister when he was tabling certain documents in the House, and I agree one statement that he made that if you are going to table all this information it would be only fair to call witnesses and let them explain their actions with respect to some of these matters. In the evidence we have had today, certain pathological information came out before this committee which had not been tabled either in the House or in the committee. Our understanding was that everything had been tabled. The information has been brought up to date. We have a pathologist here today giving us that information. It was not tabled.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: What was that evidence?

Mr. ROSS: It was the final report on the Waas herd on March 13th.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is not called for in the order before the House. The order before the House was introduced on the 3rd of March and it was finally passed on the 12th of March, and the order covers down to the date that was on the order paper requesting it. Now, the Waas cattle was slaughtered as I understand it, on the 14th day of March, and the report on that has been

given to the committee today. You will recall that at an earlier stage I said that we would have the officials here who were concerned with that and would bring the record up to date when we were discussing the matter in the committee.

Mr. Ross: In reply to that I did not say that it was in the question asked particularly in the House. The minister made the statement here in the committee within the last few days that he was going to place more material on the record so as to bring members up to date, that he was going to get us everything that would be useful to the committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Down to that date.

Mr. Ross: That was only a few days ago.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, no; when the discussion came up I am not sure whether you were here or not, but when the question came up here there was a discussion between Mr. Diefenbaker and myself on the point, and I put the position to him, would he agree to accepting the report that was asked for, that report that was asked for was up to March 12. Now, in agreeing to that, that was done and the report was brought to March 3rd. Now, he said he referred to this particular report on that occasion, and I said, well, it would be clear to him that it was not called for in the report asked for and therefore nothing had been prepared. But I did say to him that I had no objection to that report coming here when the proper person was here and he could put it in. I just want to say that is a new thing, and it was never referred to here before, and when the proper official was here he made the report, so there is nothing being held out.

Mr. Ross: The evidence is not new to the members of this committee because the argument did come up in the House and other places, that there were still veterinarians who still believe the Waas herd was not infected with foot and mouth disease.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He said, you remember what he said, that he never had final information that it was foot and mouth disease until a few days ago.

Mr. Ross: Quite true, but he had the finding there, his pathological report, on the 13th of March. Now, I have not been able to find out yet whether you or your officials received that finding or not.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He did not have his final report on the 13th of March. He buried the cattle on the 14th of March. As far as the report was concerned, the investigations were held following that and he said he only got the final report a few days ago and he brought it here today.

Mr. Ross: It puts a different complexion on the matter. Up to this point we had been led to believe that they only had to do certain things to these cattle, that the animals that were slaughtered only had the condition known as vesicular stomatitis and did not have foot and mouth disease. Now, I think it is very clear in the minds of everyone on this committee today that the matter has not been cleared up until today. Certainly, many of us had no knowledge of anything else until today. I certainly for one think it only fair to this country that we should have evidence from your chief field man, Dr. Christie, who has been resident at Regina throughout this whole business from the start. You should bring him here; and to now move that this committee should fold up without hearing some of the most important witnesses that we had hoped to hear—well, you are certainly not doing a service to the Canadian people or to members of this House of Commons if such a motion should be carried out.

Mr. BLUE: My motion has never been adhered to. I asked for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: They can discuss the motion. The motion is before the meeting.

Mr. ROSS: I have discussed the motion and objected to it.

Mr. ARGUE: My understanding is that all pertinent data and evidence in this outbreak had already been placed on the record—all the evidence right up to date—and I for one was amazed at the evidence we got this morning. I hope if there is any other evidence anywhere within that category that the minister will now bring it forth.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: What were you amazed at this morning?

Mr. ARGUE: I was amazed at that report Dr. Mitchell gave to us on the reading of the tests on the Waas cattle, confirming there was foot and mouth disease in that herd. I was amazed at that because we have had witnesses say there is a possibility there was no foot and mouth disease in that herd but only vesicular stomatitis.

Mr. JUTRAS: Dr. Carlson said he was satisfied it was foot and mouth disease.

Mr. ARGUE: That is right, but Dr. James, if I remember correctly, was rather doubtful. He felt there might not have been foot and mouth disease; and the minister himself has made the statement that it has never been proven there was foot and mouth disease in the Waas herd.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I made that remark and would have said so until today—I heard the evidence for the first time as you did, but I would have said until today there has not been anything put before me before now that gives conclusive evidence in regard to the matter. I would go further and say that no one contended today that the evidence is absolutely conclusive.

Mr. ARGUE: That there was foot and mouth disease?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That there was only foot and mouth disease there.

Mr. ARGUE: That is correct.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It was indicated that on six of these animals it never was clear whether they had the disease before, and those six animals developed foot and mouth disease.

The other fact that was brought out clearly was that all other animals were slaughtered within four days of the time the virus was injected. While that is pretty fair proof, it is not absolute proof. There have been animals develop the disease at a later date than that—but it was not thought the right thing to keep that herd alive and more than four days—and they were slaughtered. All that was brought out today but the doctor, in bringing it out, made the definite statement before he produced the record that he only got the official reports on it within the last few days.

Mr. ARGUE: And he gave us the dates of the readings.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Nobody had it before.

Mr. ARGUE: Is there any other important information that is being withheld or have we got it all now?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I imagine you could get information. I have had information within the last hour that is much more important than what is being talked about here, but I do not want to give it out now or at any other time probably.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, on the motion that this committee should suspend hearing evidence and bring in a report to the House of Commons, I want to say that I take great objection to the passage of that motion.

It has already been stated that we should hear Dr. Christie and it has been requested by the member for Melfort, Mr. Chairman—after the steering

committee had broken up and gotten away—that we should have Dr. Hewitt and Constable Sherman of the R.C.M.P. brought before the committee as witnesses.

I hope the government members, who are in the majority on this committee, will oppose this motion which I am fearful will be interpreted in the country as being a motion to throttle the work of the committee and choke off discussion. I do not think anyone wants that impression to go out to the country. In my opinion we should stay here as long as there are witnesses...

Mr. BLUE: On a question of privilege—

Mr. ARGUE: ...who may be called and who can give valuable evidence. I think the motion should be turned down.

Mr. BLUE: On a question of privilege. What impression does Mr. Argue want to go to the country? What impression does he want to go to the country?

Mr. ARGUE: I want the impression to go to the country that this committee has had all the facts and has had all the evidence, and on the basis of all the facts and all the evidence we finally make a report. I do not think that we have had all the evidence.

Mr. DECORE: This committee has been sitting for a good many hours, mornings, afternoons and nights, and we have heard evidence from important officials, from the deputy minister, veterinarians, Dr. Wells and others. I do not know what more can be gained by taking up more time. I think our officials should be allowed to go out into the field and fight this foot and mouth disease there instead of fighting a political battle here.

Mr. QUELCH: I think the motion is premature, because there has been a request for additional witnesses. First of all, we should reach a decision whether or not we are going to have those witnesses, and once this decision is reached then a motion of this kind might be in order. Mr. Chairman, you have already called the steering committee for a meeting right after this meeting. We can discuss this at the steering committee, we can bring in a report, and if the decision is that we do not hear any more witnesses the suggestion of Mr. Blue is in order. I suggest that he would be doing a service to this committee if he would withdraw his motion until after the steering committee has made its report.

Mr. BLUE: Under the conditions he has stated, I will.

The CHAIRMAN: I have sent word around to every member of the steering committee and asked if they will stay for a few minutes at the conclusion of this meeting.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): As seconder of the motion, I feel that this is a close order. We have received a good deal of evidence—

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, please, gentlemen. Order. Is it agreed by every member of the committee that we have all the evidence from Dr. Wells? Is it agreed that we have heard all the evidence and asked all the questions we intend to ask of Dr. Wells?

Agreed.

Now, a motion to adjourn this meeting will be in order.

Moved by Mr. Wylie.

Agreed.

The meeting adjourned.

HD
1781
A38
1952
No. 6

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

No. 6

WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1952

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1952



MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, May 7, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 4 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bruneau, Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Corry, Cruickshank, Darroch, Decore, Diefenbaker, Dumas, Fair, Gardiner, George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, MacLean (*Queens, P.E.I.*), Major, Masse, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Murray (*Oxford*), Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Roberge, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

The Chairman presented the second report of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, which is as follows:

Your subcommittee on agenda and procedure met on Tuesday, May 6, and Wednesday, May 7, and has agreed to recommend that, as there are no additional witnesses available before the main committee, the main committee decide whether or not any and what further witnesses are to be called.

Discussion followed regarding the calling of further witnesses.

At 6 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

A. L. Burgess,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

May 7, 1952.

4.00 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, if you will please come to order I will read out the second report of the steering committee:

Your Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure met on Tuesday, May 6, and Wednesday, May 7, and has agreed to recommend that as there are no additional witnesses available before the main committee, the main committee decide whether or not any and what further witnesses are to be called.

That is the question before you.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is that the only motion made in both of those meetings?

The CHAIRMAN: That is the recommendation this morning of this committee.

Mr. WRIGHT: You have no report of the motions that were made in the steering committee and passed by the steering committee last night?

The CHAIRMAN: This is the only report to the main committee. This is the net result of the meeting last night and the one this morning.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not know what the legal position is with regard to motions passed in a steering committee, whether it is necessary that they be brought to the committee or not and should be presented to the main committee, but I would like a ruling on that from you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STEWART: Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, this motion was the only motion that was passed this morning at the meeting and this motion was the unanimous motion of the whole committee.

Mr. WRIGHT: But that motion does not speak of a meeting held last night in which motions were made.

Mr. STEWART: Oh, no, it does not.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, it says there were two meetings of the committee.

Mr. Ross: Well, as you say, this committee was hurriedly called together today and I was a member of the steering committee and motions were passed there last night and I understood we would not be meeting again until Thursday. However, a meeting was held of the steering committee at 2 o'clock and after several discussions—I do not think there is any harm in saying what some of our views were at that steering committee—I have taken the view all along, at this morning's meeting of the steering committee and the last meeting, we discussed the witnesses we might call and I certainly did mention Dr. Christie, the chief veterinary in Saskatchewan. However, there was not a mention of that in the minutes when we checked up. However, we were going to stagger the thing so we would not have to bring men down out of the field. Other members of the committee wanted to hear other witnesses but when this matter was first brought up before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization by the minister, I think his motion read:

That the prevalence of foot and mouth disease and its attendant ramifications be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

That was on April 29. Now, in speaking that night I said that I would not want to be responsible for bringing those officials away from that area if it was going to be necessary and that it would be a hardship to take them away from the situation at that time. However, it was at the instance of the Minister of Agriculture that it was referred to his committee. No one else was urging the matter until they felt it was safe to bring these men from that area.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is not the reason, but you go on and finish.

Mr. Ross: I am just making my position clear about it and that is what happened then. Now that we have decided to examine this matter I am not satisfied that we have heard sufficient witnesses to properly make a report on this situation. We have heard certain officials of the department and we also agreed last evening that some of those officials could be recalled and questioned further yet. I still presume we can do that, but in view of certain evidence given by Dr. Childs, the veterinary director general, and of certain wires to the chief field man, Dr. Christie, and the lack of certain field reports for quite a few weeks during last winter, I think it is very essential that Dr. Christie should be called as a witness, as he is the senior man there responsible.

It was pointed out by others that we heard from Dr. Carlson and he was a good witness and is doing a very good job in the field, but nevertheless he is not the senior man in that area and to prove or disprove certain evidence already given, I think it is vital and essential that Dr. Christie be called as a witness and I am very much concerned about having him here as a witness. Other people can speak for themselves.

There was a request made to hear a Constable Sherman, I believe, and there was a difference of opinion on that and there is some history to that matter because that was also raised in the House when the member, I think the member for Rosetown-Biggart asked the Minister of Justice to table certain correspondence involving reports by this constable, and the Minister of Justice, I think quite properly, pointed out that that was not in accordance with the practice of receiving reports from the R.C.M.P., but the suggestion of the Minister of Justice to that was that if you want further information with respect to the quarantine and the administration of the same he could be called here as a witness and heard orally. That is the statement by the Minister of Justice. I do not know a thing about this situation and the statement that is in that report that they did not want to table, but I do know this, that I read in the newspaper about the meeting called recently of the western cattle producers. I do know some of the members. I think George Ross is the president for Alberta where they were dissatisfied with quarantine measures in this area and we have not done a thing other than to hear from the officials of this veterinarians' branch about the administration of the quarantine to prove or disprove such statements which these producers were concerned about. Therefore, I think we should hear from a man such as that, who was in charge of policing the area and who would know something about the administration of the quarantine area.

Then, quite a number of the members of the steering committee were desirous of hearing an independent viewpoint and one name was submitted, I think, Dr. Hewitt, a private practitioner, and after quite a lengthy discussion I think we were pretty well all agreed that it would be well to hear some independent viewpoints from a private practitioner who was not actively employed with the department here and who thought it might be well not to step on his colleagues' toes in this matter. It was agreed then that, subject to certain information the chairman might find out, we would call this veterinarian but that if he had been an employee of either the provincial or federal government or had a political axe to grind it would be fair not to call him.

Mr. WRIGHT: Might I ask you a question there? Was that in the form of a motion and was it passed by the committee—what you have just said with regard to calling Dr. Hewitt?

Mr. ROSS: The chairman will correct me if I am wrong, but I think it was. The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: And the majority of the steering committee supported it?

Mr. ROSS: As I have pointed out, with this reservation, that is true, it was carried by the committee last evening. The chairman will correct me if I am wrong.

Speaking of Dr. Christie, while all the members of this committee do not wish to drag him and his officials away from the field at this time, we are meeting here today to do a job and I am satisfied we have not done it, we have not heard sufficient witnesses yet and despite the fact that we had statements given to the steering committee that the purpose of this committee and the publicity going out from it is very detrimental to the cattle in this country, nevertheless, we are here to obtain information on behalf of the people of this country and as a member of the committee I do not think we have done that.

I do not want to see the committee's deliberations prolonged, but I am certainly very anxious to have Dr. Christie appear before this committee and I think it is very essential in the face of certain evidence that has been given here by other officials that he should be here. He is vitally concerned himself and apart from information we want, it is only fair to Dr. Christie that he be heard here too, in order that he can give his version of certain correspondence and telegrams and so on that have gone back and forth between the headquarters here and the Regina office—fair to the official himself as well as this committee.

I would hope that we would not carry out the motion made here yesterday to close up this committee without hearing from these various witnesses and, as I say, while I do not know anything about this, the other members of the committee wish to have some independent evidence from someone who has been there connected with administration in the field, either prior to the department being called in or since that, and until that is done I do not think this committee has done a job, Mr. Chairman.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, just on the one point, I think in order to get the record straight the hon. member for Souris made the statement that the committee was called entirely at my instance on this occasion and I just wish to point out it was in spite of me because of certain attitudes that were taken at the time. I took the position as strongly as I could in the House—I might have been mistaken in the beginning in not having stated the rights which civil servants have when the return was called, but my understanding has always been in this House that they have certain privileges when any documents are produced from any department and I did not think it necessary to say those should be adhered to in what was being requested at that time. Therefore, I objected to it being brought down later.

A rather strong attitude was taken by Mr. Diefenbaker and others, and I did the next day say that it would be possible to have a meeting of the committee called the following day and that I would find it most difficult to agree that the files be brought down unless the officials were going to be here to be able to answer at the earliest possible date.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The hon. minister mentioned me. I never said anything, as I remember, about the committee at the beginning.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, about the bringing down of the documents. Your attitude was towards the bringing down of the documents, that they should be brought down irrespective of what they were, that all the documents should

be brought down. I said a lot of them were privileged and should not be brought down and if they were going to be brought down, if the House was going to insist upon having them, I thought the officials should be here to answer at the earliest possible date. I just wanted to point that out, that I at no time agreed and I do not now agree that these men could be spared from the field at this time to answer questions here. I think they were taken away from the field at a most difficult time and they are still being kept away from the field at a most difficult time, in so far as they are brought here.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, I have never expressed any special desire to have Dr. Christie come down, because we have before us a file with the reports signed by the veterinarians who were actually conducting the inspection and, therefore, that information, you might say, is first-hand information and personally I doubt very much whether Dr. Christie could give us any information which we have not already received. But whilst I say that, on the other hand I do feel that if there is a strong desire expressed by a number of members of this committee to have Dr. Christie come down, it would probably be wise to do so. While I say I have no special desire myself to see him called, I do think it would be to the advantage of this committee to have a private practitioner brought down here because some members feel—and I feel that way myself to a certain extent—that perhaps when you call veterinarians employed by the government they might hesitate to make statements before the committee that might embarrass the government. There is that fear in the minds of many members, while on the other hand if we call the private practitioner he will be absolutely free to say whatever he wishes. Whether that will prove to be the case or not remains to be seen, but at least the charge could not be made that we refused to bring down before this committee a private practitioner whose opinions are absolutely free and therefore I am strongly in favour of bringing such a man down.

At the committee meeting last night I decided that Dr. Hewitt should be brought down, provided the chairman did not find out he had a political axe to grind or, on the other hand, had a disagreement with the veterinarian associations.

Mr. WRIGHT: With the veterinarian association or the government?

Mr. QUELCH: No, the western veterinarians association.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He had a disagreement with Dr. Christie and he was dealt with by the association.

Mr. QUELCH: In what way?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Because of his disagreement.

Mr. QUELCH: Is he still practising? He is still conducting the investigation?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I understand he was up before the board of the association.

Mr. QUELCH: But they did not in any way desire that his services be dispensed with?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: They gave him a talking to, I suppose, as in most of these cases.

Mr. BRYCE: Was that in connection with foot and mouth disease?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. QUELCH: We want to be sure then that this man would be regarded as a satisfactory witness by the veterinarians association and until such time as the chairman actually contacts that association, I do not think really we have that assurance.

Now, the chairman announced that he had been in touch with somebody—I do not know who it was that gave him the information—that there had been some disagreement between Dr. Hewitt and the association, but that is only

third-hand. After all, I think it would be better if the chairman would actually get in touch with the veterinarians association and find out whether that association would have any objection to Dr. Hewitt being called. If we call him and if the association says they do not want him called, they would charge, of course, that we brought down a private practitioner we should not have brought down; in other words, that we should have brought down one they recommended, so I think it would be a wise thing for the chairman to actually contact that association and find out whether or not they would be agreeable to Dr. Hewitt being called.

In regard to the policeman being called, at the time I understood that the only inspection carried out by this policeman had been that of the bulls and I could not see that anything would be accomplished by calling him. Since then I have learned that he carried out a large number of inspections on different farms. If that is the case it might be advisable that he be called. I think it would be a good case, but I hope the committee will not try to close off the discussions of this committee until such time as the witnesses that are desired by a number of us have been called. If you do that, the charge will definitely be made that you refused to hear the witnesses that many members wanted you to call.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, I believe the committee has three purposes, and the first is to determine how the disease came to spread as it did and whether or not the spread of the disease from the initial Waas herd where it really existed was in any way the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture because of the failure of the veterinarians or at least those in charge to immediately determine the question by scientific means as to whether or not this disease was vesicular stomatitis or foot and mouth disease. That, I think, is a very important matter.

If today it is possible in view of the spread to eradicate it and stop it from spreading further, everyone will be prepared to pay every tribute to these officials. But it has spread and it did spread very extensively in December and in January at a time when Dr. Christie for one admitted in Regina in December at a press conference that the only way to determine whether it is foot and mouth disease or stomatitis is by a scientific lab examination and that was borne out yesterday, according to the press references of the evidence given by the doctor in the institution in Hull.

Mr. SINNOTT: Where did that meeting take place with Dr. Christie?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That was a press conference at Regina, as I am informed.

Mr. SINNOTT: At what time?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In December.

Mr. SINNOTT: And what date?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not sure; it is in December.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Can you produce the press report?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have not got the press report here.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is like a lot of other rumours you have been spreading.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I understand the press was criticized very strongly for saying anything at all about this matter. I think the press had a responsibility to say what was taking place when it was asked that there be action in the situation which was expanding and which the officials apparently for reasons known to themselves refused to act on. Now, that is the first one.

Now then, that becomes important. Our main desire is to see that it shall not spread any more and that the danger that has been done—and it was not done by publicity; it was done by the fact, if so proven, that once the disease started if there had been action then certainly one would believe that

the number of herds infected might have been very considerably reduced after December 2 when veterinarians visited the Waas farm and saw the similarity in the symptoms of the two diseases and had there immediately been action in taking a scientific examination. Now then, that is the first thing.

The second thing is that we have to determine whether we have confidence in the same officials who having failed to act in December and January and who could have acted if the doctors' evidence which was given yesterday is correct, if we have confidence in those officials who had in two months never made a scientific test, who never made a written report or asked for instructions from Ottawa between the 5th of January and the 12th of February when the disease was existing to the extent of eleven cases—whether they should now be entrusted with the serious responsibility of being in charge of this eradication program that all of us hope and trust and indeed pray will be successful. The fearful possibilities inherent in the administration of an Act by some of these men who failed to act for a long period of time do not give that sense of security we should have.

Now then, who should be called? Mr. Gardiner made a very strong plea in the House, I was impressed by it, that the officials should be allowed to explain the situation. Now, the man in the field was Dr. Christie—the man in charge. There has been a suggestion here, let me say, because—if he made the statement that he did at the press conference in December—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: If he made the statement that he is said to have.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I say if he made it. If he made the statement then somebody was holding back Dr. Christie. Was it because he was an official under someone else in Ottawa, under Dr. Childs or someone else, that he did not do that which he realized was necessary? Surely Dr. Christie has the right to give evidence and explain why it was, if he made that statement to the press conference, that there was only one way to determine and that was by scientific examination. Dr. Christie, is an experienced man, and a man with a good reputation—why would he not do it?

The answer that he will give is one that this committee and the Canadian people have the right to expect.

Thirdly, the minister said to me on one occasion in the House where we were discussing the prices to be paid under the legislation—under the Animals Contagious Diseases Act and also under the Eradication of Diseases Act: Well, if these farmers are not satisfied they will have an opportunity of saying so.

Well, we don't want to bring down whole groups to Ottawa but they have had representative meetings and they have passed representative motions and those have not been all of commendation—in a large measure. They should have the opportunity, as they have asked for an opportunity, to send a representative or two to appear before this committee and tell their side of the story and in particular to tell this committee the degree to which quarantine was not enforced.

Now, quarantine as such is a serious thing. If all the officers take the stand this was not foot and mouth disease—if they say this is not foot and mouth disease, then there was not any reason for them not moving from farm to farm but certainly the quarantine was not effective. Certainly they were moving around. Certainly horses were being used from one farm to another in the area—a fine way to transmit the disease. Why was that done? Why were the quarantine regulations not more strictly enforced?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: At what stage?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I did not hear what you said.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: At what stage do you mean that was the case?

MR. DIEFENBAKER: That was in the month of January, beginning about the 6th or 7th of January and well on into February.

Next,—and I am not going to say what my opinion is because I am not giving evidence, I am not going to place hearsay before the committee—witnesses are available who can tell the story as to the degree to which the quarantine was not observed in the packing plants in Regina. Certainly, when I read the records showing that during the period of quarantine shipments of cattle or shipments of beef were being made, and when I realize what happened in that area near Weyburn—the Ormiston area—that is something one would wonder about—whether this was a sieve quarantine, whether it was a quarantine in name only or a sieve in action. For that reason we should have an official such as Dr. Christie.

There is one other matter, and I am one over the years that has not advocated the production of police reports—I do not want police reports in an investigation but this is not an investigation into a criminal matter—this is not an investigation as to who was guilty of some offence. That is not the case. The Department of Agriculture had assistance of the police in enforcement of the quarantine. I understand that the police officers, and in particular one police officer who gave a report, sent out in voluminous detail recommendations regarding quarantine that were not enforced—and because of shortage of staff it could not be reinforced. That police officer should have an opportunity of doing what Mr. Garson said could be done. He said he did not want to establish a precedent, as I understood his statement, by producing the report in the House of Commons; but he said there was no reason why you could not call the police officer.

There is a man who certainly could throw light or give light and information before this committee as to whether or not the quarantine that should be guaranteed as a solid quarantine—whether it was actually that in fact and not only in name. Because, if we are going through the motions of having a quarantine in the quarantine area, and if loose ingress and egress allows for possible movement back and forth of cattle or beef—

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: Are you talking now about since the general quarantine was put on?

MR. DIEFENBAKER: I am talking about the general period when it was on. We want to find out—

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: There was not any general quarantine until the 18th of February.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: We want to see whether it is any better now than it was when it was a special quarantine.

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: You should have been here yesterday to ask questions when the man who enforced the quarantine was putting it on the record.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: I got the information as to what happened yesterday with regard to that matter.

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: You were not here to ask questions.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister has been generally objecting when I did ask questions; so it is only in my absence that he really desires me to be present for questioning.

What I am going to say is I do not want to see any officials taken off the field at a time like this when it is not necessary. However Dr. Christie could give his evidence in one day and go back. The same is true for any others who should be giving evidence—and the police officer is in that same position.

Further, is there any reason why four or five members chosen from this committee, chosen by the steering committee, could not take some evidence in Regina? That would not take the officials off the field. Let those members report back here as to the evidence they secured in Regina. That would answer the fear of the minister that officials will be taken off the field.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Just let us keep this thing straight. I have not objected to anybody being called here and I have not objected to any officials being taken off the field since this started. I stated a few moments ago that I did object in the House to this whole thing being started through calling these records, and it would be necessary to have the men here to answer the files if the files were called.

I have never objected to anybody being called before this committee and I do not want my name put to objections in any way whatever. As far as I am concerned, personally, you are welcome to have the records and call witnesses but I do submit what is important is the situation in Saskatchewan and elsewhere at the moment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I remember so well that long before there was any question of production of documents—on March 3rd or 4th—the minister said: We will have this whole matter before the Committee on Agriculture.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: As soon as possible.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: He was the one who suggested that it be before the committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It was Mr. Coldwell's suggestion—give credit where credit is due.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It was accepted by the minister with alacrity. He said we will set up the committee immediately and get the whole thing clarified. If the original idea's paternity is Mr. Coldwell, certainly he had an able assistant in the minister, because the minister said: At the earliest opportunity we will have the committee set up.

So, the securing of documents had nothing to do with convening the committee—because the minister undertook on the 3rd or 4th of March to do so immediately.

Now, sir, in view of those facts I personally would like to hear Dr. Christie's evidence. He is a man who enjoys a fine reputation in Saskatchewan and I would like to hear his evidence. I would like to hear his answer to the alleged remarks made at the press conference. I would like to hear his reasons given why it was, if he did say it, that you cannot determine whether it is hoof and mouth disease or vesicular stomatitis without a chemical examination—that was as far back as December at a press conference. What was the dead end that prevented him doing that which he realized was necessary?

As far as the other witnesses are concerned, the independent veterinarians, I do not know about that. Certainly, there were six or seven veterinarians to whom reference was made. They were out there and came to certain conclusions and if my suggestion, made merely tentatively and I presume helpfully, is adopted—that three or four or five members of the committee go out representing different parties—they could have those people give evidence there and that would prevent any of the officials being removed from the field, and it will clarify the situation.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the line that my honourable friend has taken in dealing with the questions as to whether we should have more witnesses is in agreement with his general practice ever since we undertook this matter of fighting foot and mouth disease.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I cannot quite hear you.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You will hear me in a few minutes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I want to hear you.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It is in line with the general practice my honourable friend has been following ever since foot and mouth disease has been mentioned. If he had not made the statement that he made a few minutes ago with regard to what took place on the 3rd or 4th of March, I would not need to speak at all.

I had very definite arrangements on the 3rd or 4th of March before I went into the House at all. I had discussed the matter with the leader of the Conservative party, with the leader of the C.C.F. party and with the leader of the Social Credit party. I had an undertaking from all three of them that it would only take a very short time to put that special legislation through the House. It would go through without any considerable discussion so far as they were concerned.

The leader of the C.C.F. party made one condition and it was that he thought the Agriculture Committee should consider the matter at some time and that he would so say when he was speaking on the matter in the House.

Now, in short, I went into the House on the 3rd day of March as I thought with a definite understanding from the three groups on the other side—that this legislation would be put through without any delays whatsoever. My understanding was it would be put through that afternoon.

There has been a lot of comment in the press and elsewhere as to how I went into the House unprepared. I did not go into the House unprepared; I went into the House with a definite agreement.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have never heard of that undertaking.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: If you have never heard of it you should have heard of it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have never heard of it until this moment.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, just listen and you will learn a lot of things.

Mr. HARKNESS: You never mentioned it in the House yourself.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Certainly, I did. When I make undertakings with anybody I keep them. I expect them to do the same thing and I do not discuss it. But, my honourable friend has been telling why certain things were done on the 3rd and 4th of March. As a matter of fact there was a definite understanding, and if you want to know how it was carried out by one party, you will recall the leader of the Social Credit group never saying anything in the House about it. He got up—and you can go back to *Hansard* for the story—and he said that he thought this should go through at once and he did not discuss the matter. Mr. Coldwell carried his undertaking out to the letter. He got up in the House and made his remarks and said that he thought this should go through quickly but that he thought it should go to the Agriculture Committee. Right after he did that I got up and agreed it should go to the Agriculture Committee as was stated a few moments ago. However, that did not stop by honourable friend from Lake Centre continuing to talk for three days—not at all. And it has turned out since there was quite a bit of information that he had from one place and another. Some of it was not even on our files as this investigation has shown.

Now, I leave that part of it there but I suggest that probably there are some things that ought to be discussed—things that I do not think should be discussed in this committee.

I have here in my hand a speech that was delivered the night before last—or I will get the date of it here—“released Tuesday, May 6, 1952, 8 p.m.—Text of speech prepared for delivery by John Diefenbaker, Q.C., M.P.”—I do not know who put the Q.C. on that but I suppose “M.P.” is the usual thing—“Lake Centre, before the annual meeting of the Oxford County Progressive Conservative Association, Woodstock, Ontario, Tuesday, May 6, 8 p.m.”

Now my memory of the very recent past is that the leader of the Conservative party got up in the House a few days ago, not with regard to this committee but with regard to another one, and objected to some things that appeared in the press based upon discussions that had taken place in another committee. He complained that it was being dealt with some place outside the House. Here is a speech which reviews all the evidence taken before this committee, and makes findings on every important item of the evidence—findings made by the member for Lake Centre. He is not only the police court lawyer in connection with the case in eliciting evidence, but he becomes the judge and says what the conclusions are with regard to the whole matter.

Why does this committee need to sit? My honourable friend has made the judgments and peddled them all over western Ontario by radio and otherwise already—no doubt as part of a by-election program that is being carried on up in that section—not in the seat where he was speaking but just across the boundary line from it.

It was pretty much the same speech as he delivered a few moments ago. I can read from it. It has apparently been pretty well memorized because he repeated it here this afternoon very much as he gave it there last night.

In repeating it he is of course reviewing what he has been trying to get circulated through the press and over the country during the recent days before this committee.

The document says, for example: "The whole department was on vacation in facing its responsibilities throughout the period of two long months. . ."

He is very nice to me in the committee but I have never had any idea that it was always going to be that way outside. He goes on to say: "The minister, Dr. Childs, veterinary director general, and the deputy minister, should have known how dangerous the situation was potentially yet not one letter was written by any of them to Regina . . ." Just what he said a few moments ago, leaving off the reference to myself and a few others—" . . . to the men in the field to direct, advise, or counsel between January 5 to February 12."

Now, he does not say that I was in Regina during the greater part of that time right where this was going on. What did I need to write letters about?

Mr. BROWNE: You didn't know anything about it until February 16th?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Nor did my honourable friend—and his seatmate was out there as well as I was.

Mr. BROWNE: You were in Regina but you didn't know anything about it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I was in Regina and never heard of it—neither did he, and neither did you.

Mr. SINNOTT: What is wrong with that?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Every fact in connection with it is a denial of what is stated in this speech.

"The whole department was on vacation in facing its responsibility throughout a period of two long months. The minister, Dr. Childs, veterinary director general, and the deputy minister, should have known how dangerous the situation was potentially—yet not one letter was written by any of them to Regina."

I would like to know what you would want to call another veterinarian down here for when there was not a single veterinarian in the Regina either provincial, federal or private in the district that reported there was anything dangerous?

There was not a single individual in Regina who knew there was anything dangerous. And there is not one of them who has ever said so. So why be spreading the story around now that no one in Ottawa knew, or that no one knew elsewhere? He goes on to say: There were 11 new cases. "To the men in the field to direct, advise or counsel, between January 5 and February 12.

There were 11 new cases in January". But he did not take the trouble to say they were in the last week of January. That must have been apparent to him the other day, but he simply leaves the impression that all through January this thing was running rampant, when he knows there was not a single outbreak after the 28th day of December. There were cases which continued on for a while after that, but the new outbreaks were in the last week of January, and there were 11 of them during that week.

Mr. WRIGHT: There were outbreaks, but they had not been reported.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There were not exactly outbreaks, any of them; they were, rather, cases of the disease which were not new outbreaks.

Mr. WRIGHT: They were continuations of the infection from the Waas herd.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He goes on to say many other things which I do not need to enlarge upon other than to say again that in so far as the facts of the case are concerned, there was not anybody—it does not matter whether it be in my department or in the provincial department; their chief veterinarian lives right there, and many of their prominent veterinarians at Regina, or veterinarians living in towns along the railways during the outbreak, and **there was not any question about foot and mouth disease.**

Every official who has come before us, whether he was out there on the ground, or whether he was in the department here, such as Dr. Childs, Dr. Hall, and the others—as a matter of fact, Dr. Hall, who is referred to here, told us in the witness box the other day that he was sick from the middle of November until the middle of January, the 14th, I think; he came back on the 14th of January; so he was not really associated with it as all, either directly or indirectly during that period. But all the other men who were here said that they did not consider it to be dangerous, everyone of them.

As a matter of fact, all of them but one said that it is not considered the proper thing to finally diagnose this case by sending in material. Now, the one exception to that was Dr. Mitchell, who runs the plant over at Hull. Otherwise every other one of these veterinarians when asked, said that it was not the practice in the United States.

Mr. WRIGHT: It was not the practice there because they have no place to send it to.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: My friend says that it was not the practice in the United States because they have no place there to send it to. Did anyone ever know of the Americans wanting a thing and not having it? They did not think it was safe to have a plant in the United States and they do not want it there if they can get it outside.

Mr. WRIGHT: They are building one now.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Nobody can prove that yet. They got \$30 million two years ago to build one, but they have not done it yet. If they do build it, it will be built on a little island out in the ocean. But we have ours right in the middle of Hull and there may be some reason why some people have one opinion about it and others have another opinion. But at least we ought to hear all the evidence before we start to become judges in connection with it.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is all we are asking for.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: My friend says that is all they are asking for. Some others may think you have got as much evidence as you are capable of handling now from the manner in which you have been handling it. The speech goes on in somewhat similar terms and says that the only conclusion after having heard the minister in parliament and after an examination of the documents, that any reasonable man can arrive at must be that the Department of Agriculture was grossly and flagrantly negligent and must bear the responsibility for the frightful and tragic results that have flowed from

the refusal of the department to face reality for 2½ long months during which time the disease continued to spread from the Waas farm to other farms in the Regina area.

Well, that is a rather eloquent version of what was said here a few moments ago. It was prepared for Woodstock and not for this committee, for the purpose of giving a political speech outside the committee, and information on what is going on inside the committee. He would not be permitted to do that even in the House of Commons; and he knows that it would not be permitted for him to do so if it were a court case being held anywhere in Canada; and he has been referring to this as a court all the time and claiming his rights in connection with evidence, based upon the experience which he has had in court.

But it is not necessary to have evidence here as you do in court. It is true that sometimes you have hearsay evidence in committees of the House, and it is heard quite often in that way. A great deal of time has been taken up in order to show that one or other of the systems of diagnosis is the correct system. But I have not yet been convinced which is the correct system to follow in diagnosing the disease. I have heard two sets of experts. One set—and I refer to Dr. Wells, who is a very able exponent of a method of diagnosing this disease—maintained right to the end of his evidence that you could diagnose it and quite properly so right out in the field. With all due respect to the others, he was pretty convincing to me in his evidence.

MR. HARKNESS: Is not the proof of the pudding always in the eating?

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: Yes.

MR. HARKNESS: Then which of those methods did prove successful?

Right Hon. MR. GARDINER: That is what my hon. friend does not know and neither do I. But the question was asked here the other day: did you ever bring samples in before in order to determine whether or not it was that disease in a case where it was thought that you had stomatitis, and the doctor said: "Yes, once." And then he was asked whether it had been done at other times, and he said that it had. I have found out since that in so far as cases go in which there was stomatitis diagnosed as being in existence, that the only time that was done was in connection with the 1937 epidemic in Manitoba which I think extended into Alberta as well, and there might have been a case or two in Saskatchewan. But I went further and I said: "Have not samples been sent in to the Hull plant at other times." And it was said: "Yes, there are people who get information all over the place."

Now, Dr. Wells expressed it in a very expressive way last night when he said that some people get the idea that their cow is sick; and when the veterinary gets out there, he finds that the cow is going to have a calf. After all, that is the kind of case. A man does not know what is wrong with his cow or with his animals, so he sends in material to the plant in Hull; and the plant in Hull determines in all cases that it was not stomatitis but something else, so far as I can find out, except in the one epidemic in 1937, when everybody said it was stomatitis, it was some other malady.

Now, it just so happens that I was minister in 1937. My hon. friend has been doing a lot of talking about what the minister does or does not do. That case was brought to me, and it was brought to me by the Veterinary General at that time through the deputy minister. I can still see them standing at the corner of the table and explaining to me for the first time, as a new minister in the department who had never had anything to do with stomatitis before and I was not very well versed in whether we ever had foot and mouth disease before; but these men explained to me what the dangers were and what the Americans thought about it, and what the reasons were for bringing material in here, when he thought we knew we had stomatitis, and that we might have something else.

I even remember the questions that I asked them. I said: "Can this be done without giving any publicity to it anywhere else in the world?" and they said: "Yes". Well then, I said to them: "Won't I have to give publicity to it at some time?" and they said: "The only time you will have to give publicity to it is when you write your next annual report." I said: "All right; it will be all over long before that, and we will know whether we have found something other than stomatitis and probably it will be safe enough to do it this once."

So it was done and here is the report. I wonder that some of the very heavily worked members of the opposition did not find it.

Mr. HETLAND: It may be that they did not want to.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I think probably they would have liked to have found this one because they have been trying to prove all the way through that I had one idea while they had another.

When this thing first came up on the 4th of March and was discussed, I took the position that it was necessary in order to get a final decision, to send materials into the plant. My friend, the member for Brant, took the position that I was altogether wrong, and that was read on to the record here the other day by my friend from Manitoba, Mr. Jutras. Mr. Charlton took the position that I was wrong, and that all you needed to do was to make the field tests, and if you made the field tests, then you could determine by those tests whether or not it was foot and mouth disease. Now I was convinced of that away back in 1937, that the lab. test should be made, and I still held that view. It has been shaken a little in the last day or two by some of the things that have been said. I am now pretty well convinced that a nation which has fought it nine times and allowed it to spread over 22 states—one of which had it almost a year before they knew that they had it—with all that experience would be in a better position to make a decision than I am; and I certainly would not go out in this country and make political speeches and set myself up as a judge in connection with a nation with that experience which had decided otherwise. The decision that was reached in 1937 was that we had stomatitis. We did not say it, and we got away without spreading the disease in the way in which our American friends are afraid that we might spread it. But stomatitis continued to spread over a considerable area in western Canada.

On page 67 of my report of 1938 I read:

Vesicular stomatitis of horses and cattle appeared in epizootic form coincidentally with equine encephalomyelitis. The occurrence of this disease causes alarm as its clinical symptoms closely resemble those of foot and mouth disease. The virus was obtained in specimens taken from affected animals by the chief pathologist and brought to the institute, where the disease was experimentally reproduced and the properties of the virus studied.

We did not need to have all the questioning before this committee to determine what was determined in this report away back in 1938.

Mr. Ross: It was before that, was it not?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Yes, it was before that. In 1937. That report is there, and it is the one time in which you will find in an official report, in the returns so far as I have been able to find them, in an annual report of the department, the thing was tried which the hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to prove for the last week. I decided to do with fear and trembling away back in 1937 and I took care, before I did it, that nobody knew I was doing it until it was all over with; and this report was written into this book showing what we did, and I did it without reporting it at the time. But ultimately it was reported and the United States and everyone else was satis-

fied, when they read that report, we had not done any harm. Whether they thought we had done it rightly or not, the facts are there.

There have been two other cases when we have done very similar things, and one of them was prior to February 18 this year, and the other was done about the 14th day of March of this year; and in spite of what my hon. friend says, they were both done either under my orders, or with my consent. It is true that I was not informed of what was going on in connection with this until the 18th, partly because, as was suggested, I was away on vacation; but it was not, as suggested in this speech definitely arranged that Dr. Childs and I should be away at the same time so that Dr. Hall might get into some trouble. That was not the reason. I did not know of any serious disease in western Canada prior to going away and I submit again that no one else in western Canada did, either provincial authorities, municipal authorities, veterinarians, or any of the federal officials. Therefore there was not any reason why I should be excited about it at that time.

I was away. But the fact that you are away in these days does not mean that nobody can get in touch with you. I was asked about these things over the telephone on the 18th day of February, as has been indicated to this committee, and it was reported to me, what they were proposing to do, and what they had done up to that time, and I agreed with it.

Then, coming down to the matter of finally dealing with the Waas herd, I had something to do with that. Then this morning I picked up a report. I did not notice this yesterday in the committee, and I was here in the morning. But if it was said it got by me in spite of the fact that I was sitting here at the head table. The member for Assiniboia gave an interview to the press yesterday afternoon; at least it appears to be an interview to the press, and the report reads as follows:

Charges facts on plague kept hidden

Hazen Argue (CCF-Assiniboia) charged today that the government withheld "important" information dealing with the foot and mouth disease in south Saskatchewan. He made the charge following testimony by Dr. C. A. Mitchell, the government's top animal pathologist, that tests last March proved beyond a doubt that the disease had existed...

Mr. ARGUE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I gave no press interview to anybody in the press on this matter. I made a statement in the committee. I believe that is probably something which was written by some member of the press who was in this very room.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I hope you did not say this either in the committee or outside the committee.

Mr. ARGUE: The evidence will show what I said, and whatever I said was in the committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER:

He made the charge following testimony by Dr. C. A. Mitchell, the government's top animal pathologist, that tests last March proved beyond a doubt that the disease had existed on the Leonard Wass farm at McLean, Sask., when an infection first was uncovered there late last November.

I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that we had a discussion on this question at 11:00 o'clock last night. I do not know whether or not there was a discussion about it earlier in the day. I presume there must have been, or this could not have got into the afternoon press.

Mr. BROWNE: You were not here.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I was here!

Mr. BROWNE: I heard Mr. Argue say that.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: But this was in the papers in the middle of the afternoon.

Mr. ROSS: He said it yesterday morning.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is when I think he must have said it if it got in the afternoon press, but he said, according to the record, "That I cannot for the life of me understand why this information was not produced earlier in the House or in the committee."

Now, I could read what was said from the record here, but I do not think I need to take the time to look it up. When Dr. Mitchell made that statement he said he did not have the report himself until a few days ago.

My hon. friend asked me in the House sometime during the session for a report on the investigation that was made on the Waas' herd and I told him at that time that the report was not yet completed and I hope he took my word for it because I want to tell him now that when he asked the question in the House, I contacted the Hull laboratory, I asked for the information and they allowed me to look at the documents and said, "They are not yet completed. We will let you look at them conditionally upon your keeping them absolutely confidential." I kept them absolutely confidential down until yesterday or the day before, when Dr. Mitchell was here. When the matter was brought up a few days ago in this committee I said, "Those reports can be brought here when the proper official is here to bring them." He brought them and presented them to this committee, and in presenting them said that he did not have the tests completed until, I think he said, three or four days ago.

Mr. ARGUE: I do not remember that part of it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: And he said, "They are here now," and he gave the reason why he did not have them completed earlier. He said that some of his—I have forgotten the term he used in connection with some of the bottles he puts these samples in—the cubicles, were filled up, in use, and he was not able to get along quite as rapidly as he would have hoped to, but he finally got the report and here it is.

Now, I just want to point out that ever since this thing began someone has been continuously getting up on his feet, ever since away back on the 3rd of March, and saying, "The minister is burying something that he should not have buried, that the minister has not brought down what we have asked him to bring down." On a previous occasion before this committee it was shown the thing which was being asked for was lying right in front of the hon. member at the time or at least it should have been—he had the file lying right in front of him at a time when he said he had not been presented with it, and I had to listen to that repeated in the House, I had to read it in the press right across Canada, stated by a member who was apparently speaking from his place in the House with the rights of a member. The next day he did not have the common decency to correct it which might not be required in parliament, I don't know. The hon. member was shown when he came down here that he was wrong. I sat in the House the next day until the last question had been asked on the orders of the day before I said anything, and then I thought I would get up and call attention to the fact that the statement made the day before was not correct.

As a matter of fact, I think in all fairness to a member of this committee or a member of the House, the correction should have been made the next day without my having to make it, and I made it in the mildest form I could, not being just quite so cantankerous as I am today, and let it go at that.

But when one member after another comes along and does the same thing and my friend from Assiniboia leaves something wrong on the record, in view of what Dr. Mitchell said I think he ought to correct it.

Now, I would not have made a speech like this if there had not been a general speech made anyway, but I am making it and I do not want to say again that it is not for me to decide whether you are going to hear more witnesses at this time. I have learned something from the committee in the time we have been sitting here and I have no doubt others have, but I have learned one thing and it is that unless we get this committee closed up at a very early date, we are going to experience such economic difficulties in this country before we are through with this that anything that has happened up to date will look mild and it won't be because the disease is spreading; it will be because we are shut off behind our own boundary lines to deal with this whole matter.

Now, fortunately I did have an intimation before I came in here that things were looking up a little, but it can only be made to continue to look up by stopping these discussions that are going on, that are bringing out ideas that get certain people into difficulties and others into trouble. We have already brought out one matter through these privileged documents that I think will close up every civil servant in my department for some time because if the man about whom the statement was made would have happened to be a Canadian with the right to practice in Canada instead of someone from a foreign country who did not have the right to practice in Canada, we would probably have a court case by now based on a charge of libel.

If officials are not free in making their reports to say exactly what they think when they are reporting to the Department of Agriculture, then they are of no use to us at all, and if they are put in the position where everything that they are going to write on a sheet of paper is thrown on the table of this committee or on the table of the House, then they are not going to write very much.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): Mr. Chairman, would the minister refer to the tragic case of Dr. Moore?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I do not want to refer to that; it is just too difficult, that is all. But that is one case. Now, the other one is the case where I know that the hon. member who raised it at the time had not any intention of doing any harm, but it has been referred to over and over by the hon. member for Lake Centre in these terms: "I want these reports on cattle that were distributed." "I want this report on meat that was distributed," and something else that was distributed. I have stated over and over that every bit of that meat has been traced from its source to where it went and it is being watched if it is in existence still. If any of it has got away from us, then there are difficulties about that, but in spite of that we get great headings on papers here and there that caused us to battle for a whole week about the possibility of having an embargo put on again as between provinces and then when we did get the arrangement made to have no embargo, then the other provinces concerned jumped on our necks because we had agreements with some other province that they did not know about and therefore they are going to do something.

Now, we have this understanding with all the provinces, that they will co-operate with us 100 per cent and they have told us that "If you ever need any of our authorities in order to enforce anything—we know you have not got the authority to act in the province—but if you ever need any of our authorities we

will back you up in what you are doing, provided you are attempting to maintain the floor price under our beef and getting it out of the way and keeping us in a position where we can go on marketing our cattle in this country."

If anyone ever tried to operate a scheme like that with a committee like this sitting and with all the remarks that are made from time to time broadcast, then I would like to see them make it succeed. We have done it more successfully than I had ever hoped to do anything in similar circumstances. All I am suggesting is that if you are going to call more witnesses, well, then when they are here get your information, do not ask me to bring down any more great piles of material for people to search through and find out whether one civil servant said something to another during the last six months or the last two months. Those things are privileged. They ought to be considered privileged and if they are not considered privileged, we are not going to be able to fight this disease as we ought to fight it nor peddle our wares as we ought.

We want to have stated exactly what ought to be stated on these files in these reports to us from time to time, and if my friends think there was not enough stated to us in this incident, from the 1st of December down until the 14th day of February, then let us forget about the fact that there was not and let us leave it where everything that ought to be said will be said in future by having it put on the file where we can see it, and I think we can best bring that about by allowing these men to get home, get on with their job, get their work done just as soon as it is possible and there is not anyone who has got any reason for keeping Dr. Christie at home. If Dr. Christie wants to come here, is anxious to come, of course he can come and he would come probably in spite of the committee. If the committee is bound they are going to have him here whether or not, well then he can come. I do not know—I have a hard time getting the notion that I am old. Maybe I am not—I don't know—maybe I am and maybe that is why I talk so much, but it does not make very much difference. Dr. Christie is older than I am, and he might not be so anxious to travel around as some of us. But if he is wanted Dr. Christie can be brought. I do not know anything he would say that is any different from what the men who have been here have said.

Dr. Wells has been in charge of Dr. Christie ever since the fighting of the disease started. Dr. Christie has not been in charge of Dr. Wells, and Dr. Wells was here last night giving evidence and ready to tell the story, and I want to say that there was not a single question asked of Dr. Wells about the final tests on the Waas' cattle, and Dr. Wells was the man that made them and this committee was told that previously. If they have read these files they know that and Dr. Wells sat here while all that discussion was going on about the Waas' herd and there was not a single man who knew anything about the investigation excepting Dr. Wells and his assistant. They sent the material down to Ottawa and he was not asked a question about it.

The injection of the serum into the animals and so on and the taking of the materials or the injection of the virus into the animals and the taking of the materials, those are only the mechanical sides of it and all the tests in connection with it had to be carried on here after the materials got here and that extended over some weeks in time and, of course, Dr. Mitchell was the only man who could report on the final results. But the man who could have told you all about that end of it was sitting here and he was not asked any questions about it. If that is all we are bringing witnesses here for, well, let us discontinue doing so. If we are just on a political rampage, you want to find out something about the minister and the deputy minister and Dr. Childs, then you can do that at any time and a lot easier than you are doing it now. If all you want is information about the fighting of the disease on the ground, and if you

want to bring any more men down here to find out about the fighting of the disease, we are prepared to go along, but let us make up our minds about what we are going to do and stay with it.

Mr. MURRAY (*Cariboo*): Mr. Chairman, after hearing the address of the hon. the minister, I think it is only proper that we should draw attention once more to a political document which was quoted to this committee by the hon. member for Melfort, a document which no doubt pertains to the forthcoming election in Saskatchewan on June 11 and which came under the signature of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, the quotation that the hon. minister read from the newspaper referring to something I said in the committee yesterday, as I interpreted it, was not made in a press interview. It was made in this committee and was made to this committee after I heard the evidence of Dr. Mitchell and the evidence he gave at that time, as I understand it, was that the last reading on the samples that were taken from the Waas' herd were taken ninety-six hours after the 9th of March.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, that is not what he said.

Mr. ARGUE: Well, that is what I understood him to say.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Take the record and read it all back.

Mr. ARGUE: That is not what you understood him to say?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, no.

Mr. ARGUE: It is.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, what he was talking about was that the last animals were buried on the ninety-sixth hour.

Mr. ARGUE: No, he said the last reading of the report.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Oh, no.

Mr. ARGUE: All the readings on his evidence were taken ninety-six hours after the 9th of March.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: What he said—why the animals were only injected on that date.

Mr. ARGUE: Well, that is what he said as I heard it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, he did not say that.

Mr. ARGUE: When he made that statement to the committee yesterday, then I said I could not understand what had happened to those reports and why they had not been disclosed long before. And if the hon. Minister of Agriculture had wanted to take objection to anything I said in the interpretation of Dr. Mitchell's evidence, he should have said it then, but to come back as he has today and attempt to refute certain things that Dr. Mitchell has said and then suggest to the committee—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I refuted it last night at 11 o'clock, the first time I heard you say it.

Mr. ARGUE: You did not refute it at all.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You read the record.

Mr. ARGUE: And come back to this committee today and attempt to refute things Dr. Mitchell has said is neither fair to Dr. Mitchell nor fair to this committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I have refuted nothing that Dr. Mitchell said.

Mr. ARGUE: You said if the Americans wanted a laboratory down there they would build one, in talking about Dr. Mitchell's evidence that they were building a lab, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that this committee should go on with its sittings and hear evidence, that the record should be printed forthwith and

now that we have the minister giving his own interpretation of the evidence that is placed before this committee a day later, we should have that evidence, and we should go over it thoroughly and Dr. Mitchell should have a chance to appear before this committee again.

I do not mind what the hon. Minister of Agriculture says about me. I do not certainly mind what he says about the hon. member for Lake Centre, but he certainly enunciated a new rule, as far as I am concerned, affecting the House of Commons, and that was that no member had the right to speak out of the House on something that was going on in the committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Not the House, in committee.

Mr. ARGUE: Out of this building on something that was going on in the committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I did not say that. Let up keep to the record. What I said was that this committee has been referred to time after time as more or less of a court in which we are taking evidence and you do not discuss the proceedings of a court in which you are taking evidence until the final judgment is given.

Mr. ARGUE: The minister said, as I jotted it down, that he was saying—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, you do not write right.

Mr. ARGUE: I write very well and I hear very well, but if the minister put his foot in it, he put his foot in it, and that will be on the record too.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I do not know—I was very careful.

Mr. ARGUE: The minister said a member had no right to express an opinion outside the House as to the work of a committee that was in session. A member of parliament has the right and has always had the right and is going to continue to have the right to speak out of the House on anything that is before a committee and nothing the minister states here this afternoon is going to prevent me from making my own statements on anything that goes on in any committee I have been a member of and is not going to shut my mouth in any way, shape or form.

The minister went on to say further that a member had no right to speak of something that was before the House. I was home on the Easter recess and spoke on the budget, which had already been presented to the House and I had a perfect right to do it and the minister should not be enunciating this wild doctrine to us this afternoon as to what the rights of members of parliament really are.

Then, the minister turned back to an old report on samples that were sent to the laboratory by the chief pathologist and he went on to say that the minister himself took care that no one knew what he was doing in having the samples sent until after the report was made. I do not care if we had known whether the minister was sending the samples of this disease to the Hull laboratory or not. The mistake was that the samples were not sent and whether publicity was given to their sending does not enter into this picture at all. The point is the samples were not sent.

Then he went on say that no one knew in western Canada that there was a serious disease—no one in Ottawa or any place else. They knew it was stomatitis, they had diagnosed it as stomatitis and still the samples were not sent to Ottawa. We had Dr. Carlson tell the committee it was going through his mind from the start that perhaps this disease might be foot and mouth disease. The minister has stated that no one suggested outside of one witness that samples should perhaps have been sent to the Hull laboratory.

Then, he next made an interjection about a statement made by the member for Melfort that this committee now had all of the evidence that we were capable of handling. Well, I submit—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I said some members of the committee were not capable of handling the evidence.

Mr. ARGUE: I submit to the minister that that is something that should be left in the hands of the committee and we should hear all of the evidence and then if the minister wants to give us a lecture on our duties as to what questions we should have asked Dr. Wells and forgot to ask him, the minister himself as a member of this committee should ask the questions.

Then, the minister went on to say that the committee should be closed up at a very early date because of the experience we are having and the economic difficulties we are having arising out of the meetings of this committee and the publicity this means and so forth. The economic difficulties we are facing today were with us before this committee began its first session. Those economic difficulties were with us at Easter time, as long ago as that, as I have personal knowledge of. Eggs were selling for 14 cents a dozen at my local point, farmers were getting—

Mr. STEWART: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think we should restrict our remarks here to what we are going to do on this committee and whether we are going to hear any witnesses instead of making speeches for home consumption for the purposes of the election on the 11th.

Mr. ARGUE: Don't be stupid.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, again on a point of order, and you are going to withdraw that remark because if there is a young individual in parliament who is feeling his oats more than you I don't know who. After you have been here about twenty years in parliamentary life you will learn more and more and be more respectful.

Mr. ARGUE: I won't be learning much from you, either.

Now, the minister went very far afield and I won't object to that. I was merely answering his statement that we are having great economic difficulties because of the publicity given this disease and the existence of this committee, and I am saying that the same economic difficulties we are faced with today prevailed before this committee began its sittings.

Our terms of reference give us the right to inquire into the subject of the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the province of Saskatchewan and its attendant ramifications, and I should say that one of the most important ramifications of this question is fair prices and the economic difficulties we are in, and if this committee is to do a job for the producers of Canada, we should be inquiring in addition to the things we have already inquired into into the floor prices, the fact that the floor prices are not being carried out and the fact that the whole thing has broken down now to the detriment of the livestock industry. I believe we should have a thorough inquiry in which we approach the packing house people and ask them why they are not paying floor prices and find out what the trouble is and if we can get any evidence that will lead to correcting the condition that exists so that the floor prices are in fact paid, then we will be doing a service to the agricultural industry.

I do not think the majority of this committee should prevent the minority from hearing further witnesses here. After we have obtained all the evidence in that regard I feel we should do what we can as a committee to find out what is wrong with prices in Canada and to see what needs to be done in order that the established floor prices are in fact paid.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On a question of privilege, I have here the record of last night and just to bear out what I was saying I want to read it.

Mr. ARGUE: My understanding is that all pertinent data and evidence in this outbreak had already been placed on the record and all the evidence right up to date—and I for one was amazed at the evidence we got this morning. I hope if there is any other evidence anywhere within that category that the minister will bring it forth.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: What were you amazed at this morning?

Mr. ARGUE: I was amazed at that report Dr. Mitchell gave to us on the reading of the tests on the Waas' cattle, confirming there was foot and mouth disease in that herd. I was amazed at that because we have had witnesses say there is a possibility there was no foot and mouth disease in that herd but only vesicular stomatitis.

Mr. JUTRAS: Dr. Carlson said he was satisfied it was foot and mouth disease.

Mr. ARGUE: That is right, but Dr. James, if I remember correctly, was rather doubtful. He felt there might not have been foot and mouth disease; and the minister himself has made the statement that it has never been proven there was foot and mouth disease in the Waas herd.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I made that remark and would have repeated it until today—I heard the evidence for the first time as you did, but I would have said until today there has not been anything put before me before now that gives conclusive evidence in regard to the matter. I would go further and say that no one contended that the evidence is absolutely conclusive.

Mr. ARGUE: That there was foot and mouth disease?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That there was only foot and mouth disease there.

Mr. ARGUE: That is correct.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It was indicated that on six of these animals that it was never clear whether they had a disease before, and those six animals developed foot and mouth disease.

Then the record does not indicate whether those animals were sick in the early stages or not although my understanding is and always was that all 36 of those animals had the disease, and I think I said that last night only it is not in this record.

The other fact that was brought out clearly was that all other animals were slaughtered within four days of the time the virus was injected. While that is pretty fair proof, it is not absolute proof. There have been animals develop the disease after longer periods than that.

And, of course, if they had developed the disease it would have indicated they had not had it before.

But it was not thought the right thing to keep that herd alive any more than four days—and they were slaughtered.

Now, the man who insisted on them being slaughtered in four days was sitting right here when I was saying that and he said it was not safe to keep these animals around with the virus for any longer than that, no matter what happened. And so I say it was not really conclusive even then.

All that was brought out today but the doctor, in bringing it out, made the definite statement before he produced the record that he only got the official reports on it within the last few days.

Mr. ARGUE: Would you read the doctor's statement and then we will have this statement?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The doctor was here when I was saying this. He was not on the stand but he was here and he has not disputed this at any time, either to me personally or to anyone else and he cannot because the record shows it.

Mr. ARGUE: Read what he himself says, not your interpretation.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend is saying I should have got up at the time and said it. I did get up at the time and state the doctor:

—made the definite statement before he produced the record that he only got the official reports on it within the last few days.

And you said:

Mr. ARGUE: And he gave us the dates of the readings.

Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner: Nobody had it before.

Mr. ARGUE: Is there any other important information that is being withheld or have we got it all now?

Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner: I imagine you could get information. I have had information within the last hour—

Meaning yesterday.

Well, that is the story as it is on the record and it is as I told it when I was speaking before.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege I do not dispute the minister's statement that he had not that record. I do not dispute that at all. All I said was that the readings were made ninety-six hours after the 9th of March and those readings should have been produced at a much earlier date.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: They were not here on the 9th of March. I am telling you again and you can take my word for it or look it up in the record.

Mr. ARGUE: You heard what Dr. Mitchell said. Give me the evidence and I will look through it.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am not worrying about what Dr. Mitchell said there. I am telling you they were not available on the 9th of March.

Mr. ARGUE: I did not say they were available.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I do not think you have the floor. I was up before you got up, and I saw you get up. Again on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, the record is there; those animals were injected, as our files will show, in those days of March which are referred to, and the final slaughtering of the cattle took place on the 14th day of March.

Now, following that time, Dr. Mitchell said that it took an unusually long time to get the materials down here, and the reason, he explained, was that he could not get the tests made at once down here was that he did not have the proper vials to deal with it, and he was delayed somewhat; but finally, a few days ago, he finally had returns from the tests he was making, and here they are.

I know that is true for many reasons because I inquired for them a few times and was told that I could not get them. They showed me their charts which I could not understand and neither could you, I think; and they said: "Anything you can read off them, keep it secret, because it is secret."

The CHAIRMAN: Will you please allow Mr. Argue to finish with Mr. Gardiner.

Mr. ARGUE: I am not disputing that those samples or readings were not available to the minister until yesterday. I am not disputing that at all. But I say that those readings should have been available at a period much earlier than yesterday.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: They could not have been. I take the doctor's word for that. And you did say according to this press report I had failed to produce what was in existence.

Mr. ARGUE: My records in connection with the readings show, if I remember the figures correctly, that 38 head of cattle were injected, and that there were 31 head which, by the injection, were proven to have had foot and mouth disease.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, they were not. He did not say that.

Mr. ARGUE: I understand that 7 did not show that they had had foot and mouth disease; 1 was a calf which was born after the outbreak and therefore was not likely to have had foot and mouth disease; and the other 6 did not show that they had had foot and mouth disease. But Dr. Mitchell said that a period of almost 3 months had gone by and they might have lost their immunity within that period.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott and then Mr. Diefenbaker.

Mr. WRIGHT: I want to deal with a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well.

Mr. WRIGHT: The minister has before him a copy of the proceedings of yesterday's meetings but none of the other members of the committee has a copy. The minister has called some of the rest of us in this committee stupid because we have not got the same information available to us as he has. Mr. Chairman, if one member of this committee is to have a copy of the proceedings of the day before, then I think that all the members of the committee should have copies as well, so that we can follow them too, because it is very difficult to listen, as you will appreciate here, for six hours and to remember accurately everything that has been said. Therefore, if any member of this committee is to have a copy of yesterday's evidence in the committee, then I submit that the other members should have the same opportunity. I think there must be something wrong with the committee if such cannot be done and I would ask you to arrange it so that if one member is being furnished with the proceedings of this committee, that we all have a copy.

Mr. JUTRAS: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, this copy of the minutes that is referred to happens to be the clerk's copy, and it is customary at all times for the clerk of the committee to retain a copy of the minutes of the proceedings so that any member of the committee may consult them if he so wishes. Mr. Wright appears to have the impression that the minister has been placed in a privileged position in having been presented with an advance copy of the minutes of the last meeting. But that impression is entirely false. It is not the right impression to leave, or to have go on the record. The clerk's copy is there. In fact, I consulted it myself yesterday or the day before, and I know that all the members have the same privilege. Thus the minister has had a look at the clerk's copy and in this way he was only exercising the same privilege as any other member.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Sinnott.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Let us get this question of privilege cleared up. I was told a moment ago to read something else which I had not read. We might as well get it on the record. I shall now read from page 12 of the typed copy of the record of Dr. Mitchell's evidence to this committee on Tuesday, May 6, 1952, as follows referring to Mr. Young:

Dr. Plummer, who was acting in my stead, he wanted to know how you could tell if the Waas herd was infected and Dr. Plummer suggested the neutralization test and they arranged—Mr. Young and Dr. Plummer between them—that samples would be collected by Dr. Wells, I believe, and sent down.

This is all from yesterday morning's evidence of Dr. Mitchell, I believe.

When those samples arrived, I found that our cubicles were full to over-flowing and it would be impossible at that time to test these without seriously interfering with the emergency work that was going on, and so I suggested an alternative and in fact a better method of dealing with this question, namely, the inoculation of type A foot and mouth disease virus into the tongues of these cattle. So, Mr. Young agreed to this after consulting with his officials and asked me to send the material to western Canada, which I did.

It was some time before I saw a report and then I just had a casual glance at it and a few days ago I was presented with this report for review and for a determination of whether the tests showed that the animals had been infected or not.

That is the exact point that I was making, and if you want to have it all read, I will read it; but that bears out the point.

I may say that proof of past experience with foot and mouth disease virus is that the animals do not become infected, that is, past recent experience—I do not mean experience six months ago but recent experience is that the animals do not become infected.

And this was fairly recent, within six months. I am sure of that because the Waas cattle took sick on the 1st of December and they were well on the 8th. Therefore it would be about 3 months before this; and then he goes on to deal with the numbers, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Sinnott.

Mr. SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering when the member for Melfort got up whether he was going to produce the balance of that letter to which he referred the other day.

Mr. WRIGHT: You will still be wondering.

Mr. SINNOTT: However, there is a provincial election in the offing and it bears out my prediction. I saw in today's Journal the following dispatch:

Regina, Sask., May 7.—(BUP)—the Saskatchewan government today called a provincial election for June 11.

Mr. LAING: You are right on the button.

Mr. SINNOTT: I was amazed to hear the member for Lake Center. He made several statements, and to be concise and not to take up too much time as a layman does, rather than a member of the legal profession, it boils down to this: That he saw fit yesterday to make a political speech at Woodstock rather than to attend his very, very important committee where first hand evidence was produced yesterday. Now, if the member for Lake Center could have been here yesterday, he would not have said what he said today.

Evidence was brought out by Dr. Wells that the Waas farm was possibly not the first infection, but it may have possibly spread to the six farms from the Hanley herd, which was not reported, and therefore the six herds were infected before the department was able to determine any evidence whatsoever; and he also said that he would like to see some of the producers represented here to determine whether or not they were satisfied as to the prices they were receiving under the statute, which was passed to compensate them. If he had been here yesterday he would have heard Dr. Wells make this statement in answer to one of the gentlemen on the committee, that outside of one or two exceptions which he could count on the fingers of one hand, only one or two persons were dissatisfied among all those who were compensated by the Dominion Government.

Now, I do not know at this time whether the headlines, as we see them in the papers from day to day, are doing the cattle producers of this country any good. I am satisfied as a farmer, myself, that the evidence produced here is a fair sample of all the evidence that could be produced if we were to sit here for another month, the evidence of the police constable, the evidence of Dr. Christie, the evidence of Dr. Hewitt, and the request made by the member for Acadia, that there possibly should be an independent veterinarian brought down here to give evidence.

Mr. QUELCH: Not Dr. Hewitt.

Mr. SINNOTT: No, an independent witness brought down here as a veterinarian. That would not add to this committee; that is, it would not give us any information beyond what we have got already. Well, when we have been given the information that we have had the last few days, it is pretty evident that we have had a pretty fair sample; and like men who are in the field testing grain, it does not make any difference what they are testing; when they have got a pretty fair sample, they are in a position to arrive at a fairly conclusive answer.

I am satisfied now, after hearing all the evidence which has been produced by the various doctors and veterinarians, that the practice which has been followed in Canada has been exactly the practice which has been followed in the United States, and that it has been followed to the letter "T", regardless of what has happened here, and regardless, whether it be by accident or otherwise, that a method may now be brought to the fore by which we will be able to determine a virus much sooner than in the past.

Now, the evidence which has been given to this committee is to the effect that no matter what you have happening, there would be no less than six or seven herds contaminated before any evidence whatsoever was given. I know for a fact that the Minister of Agriculture was in the riding which I represent on January 11; and after that he came back to Ottawa when Mr. Churchill was over here; and following that meeting, he went back to the Regina area to his own constituency. And the evidence which he has given here was to the effect that at no time when he was in his constituency did he hear anything about foot and mouth disease. The hon. member for Lake Center was in his constituency which is right next to the constituency where this disease broke out, and he knew nothing about it, in spite of the fact that he was there all during the month of January.

Then the member, Mr. J. J. Smith, who represents the constituency of Moose Mountain in which riding the Waas farm is located knew nothing about the disease either.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, no, that is Mr. Dewar's seat.

Mr. SINNOTT: Yes, I was mistaken; but he knew nothing about it, although he had travelled through his constituency during the month of January, and nobody told him at any time that the disease was prevalent at that time. So it is quite conclusive that no matter what has been said in the light of hindsight, there has not been a speck of evidence produced that this disease was reported before the 14th day of January. It was always taken to be stomatitis.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, no, it was not even discussed in the whole community as stomatitis. I never heard of stomatitis last February when I was there.

Mr. SINNOTT: You say it was not even discussed in the whole community as stomatitis and that you never heard stomatitis mentioned, and that in fact it was not discussed.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is right.

Mr. SINNOTT: Now we have seen some terrible headlines and there is one today about which I am going to say a few words when I conclude; but there is a mountain being made out of a mole hill for the simple purpose that there is going to be a provincial election on June 11; and there are six by-elections in the offing. The member for Lake Center then—

Mr. ROSS: I think there will be a federal election within a year.

Mr. SINNOTT: As I was saying, Mr. Diefenbaker thought it was far more his duty to go and attend and speak at a by-election meeting at Woodstock than it was to attend this committee of which he is a member, and I submit that in doing so he was very derelict in his duty. It has been brought out that there were some 1,700 cattle slaughtered during this time.

I saw a heading in the Gazette this morning, and it reads as follows:

All livestock movements banned in U.K. as cattle virus spreads.

So it is quite evident that this is not the only country where there is foot and mouth disease at the present time; it is in England and Scotland, and it has extended even to the Jersey Islands. And then it goes on to say:

The (United Kingdom) government today banned the movement of all livestock throughout England and Wales, as foot and mouth disease spread in England to Jersey Channel Islands' home of the famous pedigree cows.

I have just drawn a little circle around the number of animals destroyed, to bring it up to date this year, and the total is 28,169; so it is quite evident that whatever has happened over here is only a flea-bite when compared with what has happened in Britain. Now, I am sure that the members of this committee are more interested in stamping out this disease than they are in playing politics and I am sure that the livestock producers of this country have been hit harder than they have ever been hit before.

I think it was mentioned by someone a few minutes ago that what has happened today is very, very small in comparison to the repercussions the producers will suffer this coming fall. Canada, as we all know, is a nation which produces livestock in excess of what she can consume. We depend on our outside markets to dispose of our surplus livestock, but those markets are now cut off. Consequently, this fall, beef will pile up, because we in Canada cannot consume all the beef that we produce. There will be a national disaster in Canada if we cannot dispose of our surplus beef.

A surplus of hogs has been piling up, and to date the government has seen fit to take off the hands of the producers, or off the market, 35 million pounds of pork, which is costing them 64 cents a pound; and it is quite evident that if we are not able to find a market for this meat, it is going to be even more disastrous to the producers of this country.

There has been no mention of a 10-minute limit today, because we are not on a question period. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, to have learned from the great, black headlines in today's paper what I am about to announce, and I am sorry to have to bring it up, because the man I am going to refer to has a wife and family who are very near to us here; nevertheless it is a fact, and the headlines read as follows:

PROBE SUDDEN DEATH OF OTTAWA OFFICIAL IN WEST DIRECTING CATTLE PLAGUE CHECK.

Dr. L. Moore found dead in hotel. Worked day and night in fight against foot and mouth outbreak.

It is quite evident, Mr. Chairman, that this man, since he has been on the job, has worked day and night. He has done the very best he could to stamp out this plague; he worked as hard as he could, travelling as far as he could,

and visiting as many farms as he could; and after all, when he got back to his hotel at night after doing what he could all day, and saw these headlines condemning him for doing the job that he has done, I think this is a case where work and publicity have driven this man to do what he did.

Now I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that this kind of publicity is the worst kind of publicity for Canada. We are interested in Canada, and as Canadians we want to help the producers; but if you want to destroy the producers and destroy Canada, then headlines of this kind will do that very thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Will someone move we adjourn?

Mr. JUTRAS: I move.

Carried.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. Do I now get an opportunity to answer two things which have just been raised?

The CHAIRMAN: There are other speakers to come too, Mr. Diefenbaker.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Until when do you adjourn?

The CHAIRMAN: I find here that there are six meetings tomorrow and I think we will have to adjourn subject to the call of the chair. I will see if we can get one of the rooms in the other House tomorrow morning.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: And after all the alibis the guillotine should not be applied like that.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I do not have any alibis.

—The committee adjourned.

HD
1781
A38
1952
No 7

HOUSE OF COMMONS
Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

No. 7

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1952

WITNESS:

Dr. N. D. Christie, District Veterinarian, Department of Agriculture,
Regina, Sask.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P., 1952
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1952



MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, May 13, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Aylesworth, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Cruickshank, Darroch, Decore, Dinsdale, Fair, Gardiner, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, Major, McCubbin, McLean, (*Huron-Perth*), Murray (*Oxford*), Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Roberge, Ross (*Souris*), Stewart (*Yorkton*), Sinnott, White (*Middlesex East*), Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Dr. N. D. Christie, District Veterinarian, Department of Agriculture, Regina, Sask.

The Chairman tabled answers to certain questions asked by Mr. Wright, which are printed as *Appendices A* and *B* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Dr. Christie was called, heard and questioned.

At 1 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the chair.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

MAY 13, 1952.

11.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Gentlemen, from personal observations, I gleaned during previous meetings with respect to the matter now before the committee some members were desirous of having Dr. N. D. Christie, district veterinarian for the Canada Department of Agriculture appear before the committee. Dr. Christie is present this morning and I will now call upon Dr. Christie.

Dr. N. D. Christie, District Veterinarian (Regina), Canada Department of Agriculture, called:

Mr. STEWART: I think, Mr. Chairman, as you did not mention it, if the doctor would give the committee, as previous witnesses did, his qualifications in the department—

By the Chairman:

Q. Would you state your qualifications and the years you have been with the department, please?—A. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I at the present time am district veterinarian for the province of Saskatchewan. I have been in that position for the last twelve years. I reported for duty with this department the 30th day of May, 1910, and on the 30th day of May this month I will have served forty-two years.

I would like to say that I was born and raised on a farm down here in the province of Quebec at the town of Lachute and I went west to Alberta in 1904. I worked for farmers and hauled coal in the winter time until 1907 when I went east to enter the Ontario Veterinary College, I graduated in 1910 and, as I said, reported for duty here in the city of Ottawa on the 30th day of May, 1910.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions of Dr. Christie?

Mr. DECORE: I was just wondering before you proceed with questions, could we adopt the same rule as we had before of ten-minute questioning?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I presume that what you are asking is, are there any other questions about his qualifications. I presume you are going to let him give a statement.

Mr. ARGUE: That would be preferable, yes.

The WITNESS: Do you wish me to make a statement?

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Yes, about the preventive measures which you have taken out there since it started?—A. I want to say that the measures we have taken out there, when first we heard of it we considered it was stomatitis. It was reported to Dr. Carlson—I was out of the city on the Saturday evening and Sunday, December 1 and December 2—but on December 1, Saturday evening, Dr. Hunter, a veterinary practitioner in the city of Regina, reported to Dr. Carlson that he

had a condition he considered was stomatitis in livestock and he would like someone to re-visit the place and help him to diagnose the condition. On Sunday morning, December 2, Dr. Carlson and Dr. James, along with Dr. Hunter, visited the premises of Mr. Waas at McLean and diagnosed the condition as stomatitis.

On Monday morning, December 3, when I went to the office, Dr. Carlson and Dr. James reported to me the condition they had found and within an hour of the time it was reported to me I think I notified the veterinary director general here in Ottawa. That was on December 3.

I then took up the matter that I considered—even though it was considered stomatitis—whether we should not quarantine the premises as a precautionary measure, to which Dr. Childs agreed and thought was the best policy to adopt. That was done, and in a few days, four or five days, one of his neighbour's cattle showed signs of infection and again Dr. James went out and found a similar condition. A couple of days later another neighbour reported and Dr. James again went out and I instructed Dr. James to quarantine the premises in both these latest instances.

I consider today that the result of my insisting on these quarantines is the reason why the infection is limited to the small area in which it is confined. Had not that precaution been taken, it certainly, to my mind, would have been spread farther afield and I am most thankful myself that I was guided in my judgment in insisting on those precautions.

Later in the month of December, I believe December 28 it was, it was reported in the Burns feedlot in Regina. That was investigated and the premises were quarantined. The movement of livestock out of those yards was prohibited.

Then, I believe, there was one other place during the month of January that was quarantined. I think, Mr. Chairman, that there should be a correction of previous information given.

I have noted from the minutes of proceedings and evidence that incorrect information was brought out about the number of infected premises reported to the Regina office during December, January and the first two weeks of February. I wish to make it plain that there were only five premises reported in December, in January seven premises were reported, all of these being from January 23 until the end of the month, and from February 1 to February 13 inclusive only four premises were reported. I wish this to serve as a correction for information recorded on pages 105, 106, 109, 121 and 158.

I would like to point out that in the early stages of this infection, the symptoms presented in these animals were very mild and led to our diagnosis of stomatitis. At this time we had no idea that we were dealing with anything other than stomatitis.

Finally, in February the outbreaks that occurred became more severe and the symptoms were more of a nature to cause us to think that we were dealing with something of a more serious nature. On February 12 this information was phoned to Ottawa by Dr. Carlson. I myself had a cold at the time and I had received information that I would be commencing my retiring leave on the 1st of April. So I said to Dr. Carlson that in view of the cold I had and in view of the fact that he would be at least taking over in an acting capacity I thought he should phone rather than myself.

However, I was sitting beside him when he phoned to Ottawa and suggested that the infection we were dealing with was taking on a more serious aspect and asked that we receive additional help to deal with the outbreak. That was, I believe, February 12, and I believe it was the following morning I received a wire from Dr. Hall, the assistant veterinary director general, instructing me to have specimens collected and forwarded to the lab at Hull.

I would like to say here that this rather amazed me, certainly surprised me, for after years of schooling in the danger of forwarding specimens of a virus nature, I did not look very kindly on forwarding specimens but they were the instructions. I believe it was that evening or the following evening the specimens—well, I believe it was the following day—the specimens were collected by Dr. Carlson and they were sent by air express addressed to the laboratory at Hull.

The following morning I received a wire from the veterinary director general countermanding those instructions from Dr. Hall. However, the specimens had left the previous evening and were on their way. In a day or so Dr. Childs and Dr. Wells proceeded from Ottawa to Regina and on their arrival they realized the seriousness of the outbreak that we were dealing with and immediately took up the matter with the officials in Ottawa and started the ball rolling to have a quarantine area placed around the outbreaks that we were dealing with. From then on the matter has been prosecuted with all the energy and resources at our disposal.

In my forty-two years I have not worked harder or put in any longer days and evenings than I have in dealing with this outbreak. I can assure you of that, and let me say that the veterinarians assisting me out there have given of their best. I have been blessed with the assistance of some of the best veterinarians in the Dominion of Canada and they have worked just as hard as I have and I certainly would like to bespeak the wonderful work done by the men under my supervision.

I do not know, gentlemen, that there is anything more I can say. I should say that in view of the American market and knowing their feelings about sending specimens of any kind or removing specimens and taking them from an infected premises and with our economy of having that market in the United States, I at no time considered it advisable to take specimens and forward them to the lab here in Hull, Quebec. I have very strong opinions in that regard and I realize there may be others with opposite views but those are my personal opinions and I know they are the opinions of the American veterinarians and the people dealing with contagious diseases of a virus nature in the United States.

I may say that the Americans, Dr. Shahan and Dr. Mulhern, who is up with us at the present time, Dr. Duckworth, who is assistant director of agriculture for the State of California, all emphasized their ideas along the lines and during their stay there and since their return to the United States have commended the work that we have done. I have correspondence here that I can read that might give you some information.

Here is a copy of a letter I received from Dr. Wilkins, the state veterinarian of the State of Montana. I won't take the time to read it all, but there are a couple of paragraphs I would like to read to you:

I recently had a very fine visit with Dr. Ray Duckworth on his return to California and it was his belief that you folks are doing an excellent job and that as far as he is concerned he is confident that the disease may be eradicated; in other words, Dr. Duckworth confirms my observations and belief and confidence.

I want you to know that I have done all I possibly could to keep down hysteria and to soft pedal a push on the part of some livestock people who insist on disinfecting stations and the doing of these things which we are confident are of little or no worth. We believe in pinning down the infection on infected premises until disinfection is completed and, of course, using the same precautions as you are using to check all herds in the quarantine area and to investigate places conceivably suspected.

Mr. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that that whole letter be included in the report—the whole letter, not just that part.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, there are some matters of personal interest in the letter and we are asking exactly the same right as all members have—that only that part which is relevant be read. We expect the same treatment for the witness from this committee as other members.

Mr. CHARLTON: Now then, Mr. Chairman, is the letter available for the members of the committee to read if it is not placed on *Hansard*?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Yes, we can make it available. It has the names of some people who raised complaints in it which I would not like to disclose.

Mr. DECORE: I was wondering if the other letter could be made available to the committee to read too?

The WITNESS: “Dr. Shahan said that according to available evidence the disease has probably existed in . . .”

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Is this the same letter?—A. This is the United States Department of Agriculture, agricultural research administration.

Dr. Shahan said that according to available evidence the disease has probably existed in the affected area since early in December. It was not recognized immediately because its earlier manifestations were extremely mild and not typical of foot and mouth disease. First diagnosis confused the infection with vesicular stomatitis, a disease with external symptoms similar to foot and mouth disease. However, as the virus passed from animal to animal and from herd to herd the virulence of the disease increased and its identifying characteristics became apparent. Dr. Shahan said that the original source of the outbreak has not been determined but several possibilities are being investigated by Canadian authorities.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what is he reading from there? It is not clear to me what he is reading from. Is that a letter from Dr. Shahan?

Mr. STEWART: It is a report from the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BROWNE: I am not asking you.

The CHAIRMAN: It is from the United States Department of Agriculture, agricultural research administration, Washington.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Is it signed by anybody?—A. This is taken from a bulletin that was prepared—

The CHAIRMAN: “The United States Observer reports on the foot and mouth disease outbreak in Canada.”

Mr. BROWNE: What is it?

The CHAIRMAN: It is an observer's report.

Mr. BROWNE: Well, I would like to see the original of that produced because nobody seems to know what it is a copy of.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the original is available if you wish to see it.

Mr. BROWNE: I would like to have it tabled.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, you do not table originals. We keep the originals on file but if my hon. friend is not prepared to accept the statement of the department, we would be glad to have someone come in and take an affidavit on it.

Mr. BROWNE: Why can't you table the original document?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The original document stays on file in the department.

Mr. BROWNE: That is not so in the House of Commons.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Oh, yes, the file you get tabled in the House of Commons is not original documents.

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you through with your report, Dr. Christie?—A. Yes.

Mr. ARGUE: The first question I wanted to ask was if the tabling of any of these documents from the United States had been cleared with the respective United States governments? We always understood in the House that if anything of that nature is tabled it must be cleared with the United States government.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: This is a bulletin that is sent out to everybody. Anybody can get it; it is not a confidential document.

Mr. ARGUE: What about the other letter with the two paragraphs which were read?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The other letter is a personal letter from a similar official in Montana to our official in Canada and there is only one objection to it being tabled and that is these names.

Mr. ARGUE: I would like to thank Dr. Christie for his report this morning and there are one or two questions I would like to ask the doctor. In discussions—and you referred to your discussions with the American veterinarians, Dr. Shahan and one or two others—did you ever discuss with them the possibility of their appearing in person before this committee so that we could get whatever evidence they might have first-hand rather than second-hand?

The WITNESS: No, sir.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I think you might take into consideration making arrangements that those people referred to are called so that we can get their evidence directly.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Could you tell me the exact time the samples were mailed to the lab in Hull—the approximate time they were mailed to the lab in Hull?—A. You mean the time of the day, sir?

Q. The dates and the time of day?—A. I think that was—I believe that was the 14th and they would be mailed in the evening. I think that was the evening of the 14th.

Q. Then, my question is this: were the samples actually in the mails before the countermanding telegram was received?—A. They were not sent by mail, sir; they were sent by air express.

Q. Had they actually gone?—A. Yes.

Q. You said the Americans are against shipping virus samples. Where would they ship them if they were to send them for diagnosis?—A. I have never known them to ship any anywhere.

Q. Do you know whether it is correct or not that there is no lab in the United States comparable to our lab in Hull for testing such samples?—A. That is right, and that is not due to any lack of ability to build one.

Q. Are you aware that such a lab is presently being built in the United States?—A. No, I am aware that they have considered it, not on the mainland of the United States but on some island. I knew that that was being considered.

Q. Of course, if they established such a lab the samples would have to be sent there, whether it is on an island or anywhere else?—A. No, I do not think they would be sent; someone would carry them there.

Q. Perhaps. Are you aware of the pamphlet issued by your department, the Department of Agriculture, in 1942, in reference to foot and mouth disease? Are you acquainted with that pamphlet?—A. I have read that, but not just recently.

Q. Are you aware that in that pamphlet on page 10 are given the detailed instructions on how to send samples to a lab?—A. Yes. I doubt if that had reference to foot and mouth disease—I doubt it.

Q. Yes, I point out to you, sir, that it does have reference to foot and mouth disease. I can read the section.—A. That is important, too.

Q. I hate to take up my ten minutes by reading from this but if it is the wish that I should read it I will be prepared to do so. On page 10 it says the following:

The measures of control necessary—

And the whole pamphlet has reference to foot and mouth disease.

The measures of control necessary are so severe that before the diagnosis, in a primary outbreak, was accepted by the Health of Animals Division inoculation experiments would probably be carried out on hogs, calves and horses. If these experiments proved the presence of the disease the slaughter of the herd would follow, rigid quarantine would, of course, be established from the beginning.

For laboratory examination material should only be collected by a veterinary inspector who understands and minutely observes all the precautions necessary in handling it. The bottle or sealer to contain the specimen should first be carefully cleansed and then sterilized in boiling water. Glycerine and boiling water, in equal parts, are poured into the container and into this fluid, when cooled, the specimen is dropped and immersed. When possible, the specimen should include an intact vesicle. For purposes of inoculation it is best to collect the contents of one or two vesicles by means of a hypodermic syringe and then expel the fluid into a small sterile test tube or vial. The bottles containing the specimen should always be hermetically sealed and then washed on the outside with a disinfectant. At the same time the operator's hands should be disinfected. A label giving the necessary particulars must be attached which in addition must be clearly marked in large letters "DANGEROUS—To be opened by the pathologist." This container is then to be carefully packed in an outer container so as to avoid any possibility of breakage or leakage in transit to the laboratory.

Were you aware of that part of the pamphlet sent out by your department in 1942?—A. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in 1945, the spring of 1945, along with Dr. Childs I proceeded to the lab at Hull and at that time, if my memory serves me rightly, we were told otherwise—not to take specimens but to confine it to the spot and hold field tests.

Q. Who instructed you?—A. We were taking instructions and lectures over at Hull under the direction of Dr. Mitchell.

Q. Dr. Mitchell instructed you against sending in such samples?—A. Yes, at that time.

Q. That is 1945?—A. Yes, 1945.

Q. Are you aware that such a course was held approximately a year ago at which Dr. Carlson was present?—A. Yes.

Q. And are you aware that at that school, precise instructions were given to the people at the school as to what method to follow in sending such virus samples to the lab?—A. Yes.

Q. Well then, do you agree that the instructions given a year ago take every possible precaution to see that such samples do not break in transit?—A. If those instructions were given I cannot agree with them myself personally.

Q. Can you give me any reason why the department after sending out this pamphlet in 1942 giving a definite method by which samples could be sent in such a way that there would be no possibility of breakage and such instructions were given again a year ago, that there should be any question in your mind as to why such instructions were adopted and were in fact valid?—A. I consider that there is always the possibility of breakage and the spreading of infection in cases of accident. We know that in the mail, or express, parcels go astray. We have all had experiences of that kind and there is that possibility in sending specimens of a virus nature just the same as any other parcel.

Q. Are you aware of any such samples that have been sent to the lab in Hull either in regard to the present outbreak or some past virus outbreak ever having broken?—A. No, I have not, but there is always a first time.

Q. Well, I suggest to you that the excuse given that such a sample might break is not valid and is shown not to be valid by the fact that samples have come in with regard to foot and mouth virus; and foot and mouth virus was sent to the lab under the type of instructions I have read. Why do they not send a man out there with a brief-case to carry the samples back?

Mr. DECORE: What about the American authorities?

Mr. ARGUE: I am asking the question.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Can you tell me any reason why they do not have a man going back and forth to Regina with a brief-case to carry these samples down here?—

A. Because of the fact that the Americans would soon be aware of it and our embargo would be delayed and it would affect their idea of lifting the embargo. I am well aware of that.

Q. In other words, bringing samples by person in a brief-case is considered by the Americans more dangerous than flying the samples by air express as has been done here?—A. I consider either of them dangerous.

Q. Then, you are following a dangerous procedure and have followed a dangerous procedure every time a sample was sent?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. And that is likely to affect the American embargo?—A. Yes.

Mr. ARGUE: I have here—

The CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Mr. ARGUE: Now, if the chairman rules that I sit down, I will sit down, but I read extensively from that pamphlet for the information of the committee and I think that might be taken into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: I will give you an extra two minutes for that.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Dr. Christie, I have here a copy of the instructions sent out over the signature of Dr. J. G. Taggart, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, in regard to lifting the quarantine on the premises of Mr. Ernest Seaford, Bethune, Saskatchewan, under date of March 11. You are acquainted with those kinds of instructions lifting quarantine?—A. Yes, that is form 54.

Q. Can you tell me in those instructions, form 54, that that is a signature of the deputy minister? I just have a copy here so I cannot tell you if it is his signature or not. But in the original is that the signature of the deputy minister? It is shown to me in this copy as being a signature.—A. It is a typewritten signature.

Q. The original has the deputy minister's signature on it?—A. I do not see it because the original—all I get is a copy at Regina—the owner gets the original.

Q. And the original, as I understand from the information given, the original does have Dr. Taggart's signature? Someone asked the date on the form.—A. This is the 11th of March, 1952—

Q. If you might get that information from the official beside you I would like to have that on the record, sir.—A. I do not see the original. I get just a copy at Regina. I receive a copy of what is sent to the owner.

Q. As I heard the information given, I understood it to be that there is a signature of the deputy minister on such an order lifting a quarantine. Then, I would like to know if exactly the same type of order lifting the quarantine was issued in respect of the quarantine on the farm L. P. Waas of McLean?—A. They are all the same form, form 54.

Q. Then, can you tell me how Dr. Taggart could send out a form lifting a quarantine on the Waas farm December 8 over his own signature without being aware of a vesicular disease having been prevalent in Saskatchewan? Dr. Taggart told the committee that he was not aware of this disease in any way until the 2nd or 3rd day of February.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted—

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor and I would like an answer to the question.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You are putting in a lot of information which, to use a term of someone else, is hearsay evidence pretty much. It is not a matter of getting the facts. Now, there is information which has been demonstrated here that the deputy minister signs for me. There is in the department a man who acts as an acting deputy he signs for the deputy when he is not there to sign in all these routine things. They may be signed by the deputy himself in person but they may be signed by someone acting for him and you cannot just conclude that Dr. Taggart was not telling the truth because this document with nobody's signature on it is here before you.

Mr. ARGUE: I am not saying Dr. Taggart was not telling the truth in the sense that he told a definite falsehood, but I am wondering if perhaps Dr. Taggart signs so many of these forms that the form did in fact go out over his signature without him being aware of what he was doing.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: There were 25,000 of them referred to by our witness and I would guess he does not sign them all.

Mr. ARGUE: Well, I am asking the question and I am trying to get the evidence on the record and the hon. minister has not placed anything on the record himself.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, for you to procure for this committee a copy of the original order lifting the quarantine on the Waas farm. In my opinion that is important and may well upset a whole lot of the evidence we have already received.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Dr. Christie, I am sure it is the wish of most of us here in the committee to say here and now that very few of us, if any, are criticizing what has been done since February 12 by any veterinarian in the field at Regina. As far as I am concerned personally at least, that is true. It is previous to that time, Dr. Christie that we are criticizing.

Now, Dr. Christie, you said that the department policy with regard to the sending of samples in to the lab at Hull has been against sending any samples since you have been in the department. That is a true statement of what you said, was it not?—A. More particularly since 1945.

Q. More particularly since 1945?—A. Yes.

Q. I am glad you said that because I was just going to say there were several bulletins written previous to that time as another witness has put before the committee and I have a copy of one here written in 1930. You did work under Dr. Cameron, who was veterinary director general, did you not?—A. Yes.

Q. Was that rule in effect when Dr. Cameron was veterinary director general?—A. I cannot confirm that it was.

Q. You would not like to say whether it was or not?—A. I would not like to say it was.

Q. But that is with respect to vesicular diseases only—other virus diseases are transmitted?—A. I mean virus disease.

Q. Virus diseases only?—A. Vesicular virus diseases.

Q. Now, Dr. Christie, when did Dr. Childs first go into the head office in Ottawa?—A. 1946, I believe.

Q. Then it is around the time that Dr. Childs came in that this ruling has been in force?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, you say that this—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Now, Mr. Chairman, let us keep the record straight. This ruling was made in 1945 and Dr. Childs came into the department in 1946. How could it be Dr. Childs?

Mr. CHARLTON: Well, how could it be anybody else?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, in other words, you are after one individual. Let us stick to the facts.

Mr. CHARLTON: I am trying to stick to the facts, Mr. Chairman, and there are some other facts coming out that are not quite facts.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Dr. Christie, feeling as you do regarding sending those samples, you still say that it is dangerous to send them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you account for these samples being sent—I would not say every day—but several samples after February 14, when that sample was brought in first—how do you account for the fact that samples are being sent regularly now?—A. I would have to leave that to those who issued those instructions. I am not prepared to answer that.

Q. But you still say it is dangerous procedure?—A. I do.

Q. Then, feeling as you do regarding that, would you think in your own mind that it was good policy to have carried on the animal inoculations that were carried on there in the district, as they were carried on, leaving them with one man alone to do the inoculation and one man alone to read those readings?—A. Those inoculations were not made by one man alone; he always had assistants with him.

Q. Well, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but the man who did the inoculations told us otherwise in this committee. He told us he never had anybody else with him except the owner of the herd when he made the inoculations or when he read the inoculations—Dr. James.—A. When we had those tests cases?

Q. When the inoculations were made on the 3rd of December, two animals on the Waas farm; one animal on the Woods farm December 12, one horse; and one horse on the Haun farm on December 12.—A. He may have been alone with the owner on those, but those cases where we purchased the animals for those tests after we were dealing with foot and mouth disease, there was someone with him.

Q. That is true, Mr. Chairman, but I am not suggesting there was not anybody with him after the disease had been diagnosed but isn't it important before the disease is diagnosed not afterwards? I mean, the important stage, Dr. Christie, is before the diagnosis is made at all, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it not true that one veterinarian who had been with the department for twenty-two and a half years, true, one veterinarian was left under your supposed instructions, I imagine—A. Yes.

Q. One veterinarian was left to do all the animal inoculations that were done?—A. You must remember that we considered we were dealing with stomatitis.

Q. Oh, yes, Dr. Christie, but you also must remember that stomatitis is very similar to foot and mouth disease, and you must have had some suspicion, you must have thought that it was foot and mouth disease or you would not have made these inoculations?—A. I had every confidence in our man who was doing that work.

Q. That is true, but is it not better to have had that done in any case, no matter how good the man is?—A. Yes, and knowing now what we were then dealing with; what later we found out; had we had any suspicion that we were dealing with foot and mouth disease there would have been more than one man.

Q. Well, Dr. Christie, there arose a suspicion following that that it might be foot and mouth disease; at least, that it was a dangerous vesicular disease of some kind?—A. No, I don't say so. We took precautions. The imposition of the quarantine on the premises was a precaution.

Q. Yes, that is true. Then, why did you make animal inoculations at all if you were so sure it was vesicular stomatitis?—A. To confirm our diagnosis.

Q. To confirm it?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it true, Mr. Christie that there was only one of these four horses inoculated, and that it was the first that showed any symptoms of the disease?—A. One showed definite symptoms, a definite reaction, the other one, slight—one of them.

Q. Yes, the second one, from the Waas herd—slight, very slight, and only after five days?—A. Yes.

Q. Well then, would you be satisfied that that was a sure indication?—A. Yes. I never had any idea of questioning Dr. James' diagnosis in that respect.

Q. It did not occur you to question Dr. James' diagnosis, you didn't question that, it was sufficient. You were in charge in Regina, is that not true?—A. Yes, that is true.

Q. Well then, you saw all these reports that came in, did you not, Dr. Christie?—A. Yes, I did.

Q. Did you check them over every day?—A. Either myself or Dr. Carlson. I would not say that I saw absolutely all of them, but I think in this case I saw most of them.

Q. Ordinarily you would check them over in the course of the day?—A. Yes.

Q. And Dr. James said at the time he was here, I believe, that these reports were all checked over by your office?—A. Yes.

Q. And O.K.'d before they were forwarded to the veterinary director general?—A. Initialed by Dr. Carlson or myself.

Q. Then may I ask you this, Dr. Christie: I have here the quarantine report number P.H.A. 46—I imagine that was presented to you—part of that form reads this way: "the two horses which I attempted to inoculate experimentally are exhibiting no symptoms or lesions so far and appear quite healthy. I am now quite satisfied that we are not dealing with a dangerous infectious disease". Do you agree with that report?—A. Pardon?

Q. Do you agree with that report?—A. I knew from his personal discussion with me that he was confident that he was dealing with stomatitis. He did not mean it in the way that up until then, it was a disease that—regardless of them not showing anything, the symptoms otherwise to him indicated that it was only stomatitis. However, later on, within another day or two after he did find reactions.

Q. Yes, but, Dr. Christie, are you satisfied with the wording of this report?—A. No, I would say the wording is not good. But I know in talking with him on that occasion that he was satisfied that there was nothing wrong up to that time. Regardless of that he was satisfied that it was stomatitis; and later on, within a day or two after that he did get a reaction.

Q. You are not satisfied with the actual wording of this report?—A. No. I could see that the wording had the implication that because there was no other symptoms he was satisfied. That is not my idea of what he explained—that that was not what he was trying to put across, or—

Q. He did not change his report?—A. No, he did not. I have not changed it. We were getting these reports away as fast as we could, as we always do. I have tried always to get these reports forwarded to Ottawa with as little delay as possible.

Q. I see on December 8, Dr. Christie, I think the report to which you referred just a moment ago—he says there the two horses inoculated showed symptoms but he is now satisfied—I mean, it is an absolutely contradictory statement, report.

The CHAIRMAN: Another minute, Mr. Charlton.

By Mr. Charlton:

Q. Now, Dr. Christie, is it not true—I think this has been brought out before—is it not a fact that the U.S. officials did not want any samples sent across the country. It is true, is it not, that they are now building a laboratory at Grosse Isle in the St. Lawrence? Is that not true?—A. I have heard that since I came to Ottawa yesterday afternoon. I was not aware that anything was being considered, I do not know they are making a start on that work.

Q. You did not suspect that they were building that lab until you came down here?—A. No.

Q. And, obviously, they are going to make use of it after they have built it?—A. Yes. That would seem obvious.

Q. Would you not think that as we have better facilities now than back in 1929 or '30 it is now safer to send samples than it was in those days?—A. I may be old fashioned in my ideas, but I am still not in favour of it.

Q. You are still not in favour of it?—A. No.

The CHAIRMAN: Your time is up, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Stewart is next.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Dr. Christie, you say that you have these Americans up here watching this performance?—A. Yes.

Q. And when did they get there?—A. Dr. Shahan, from the Bureau of Animal Industry in Washington, I believe arrived in Regina on February 21st, around that—I believe it was the 21st that he arrived there.

Q. Now you say that these Americans watched closely what you were doing there to prevent this disease spreading and the investigation of it.—A. Yes sir.

Q. And that all of the American officials who went up there expressed approval of the steps you and the other veterinarians were taking there on behalf of Canada?—A. Absolutely.

Q. They were not critical of you in any respect or your preventive measures?—A. No, sir.

Q. And you have read into the record a report from one of them?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, you have served with this department for a number of years, as you have indicated, doctor?—A. Yes.

Q. And during that time you have had different ministers of different political parties at the head of the department?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And throughout the operation of that department it was always the instruction to you by officials of the department that it was highly dangerous to send samples of an infectious disease in any respect to Ottawa?—A. At least to be most careful and they preferred not to send them unless with the greatest of care.

Q. And then, as an official of the department, you were always instructed particularly in connection with foot and mouth disease which the States had on 9 occasions?—A. That is correct.

Q. That the American market for cattle was very important?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And that you were to cooperate in every respect with the American officials?—A. Yes.

Q. And you endeavoured to do so in connection with this matter?—A. During my years at the department I certainly have.

Q. And that due to the proximity of Canada to the United States and the knowledge on the part of Canadian veterinarians that any economic repercussions caused by an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Canada would be mainly that imposed by the United States embargo, and that any action that veterinarians would take here would naturally be tempered by the wish to conform to United States practice? That is correct?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And it has been known for many years that the United States authorities require diagnosis of the vesicular diseases on the premises where it exists; that is correct?—A. That is correct.

Q. By means of field tests?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Certainly the Americans do not have a laboratory such as ours, but that could not be from lack of ability to build one; that is correct?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Now, in the department, doctor, I think there has been some mention made away back as far as 1932 and 1933 about joining up the test department with the field department? One of the ministers at that time suggested that? Do you remember that episode?—A. Yes, very distinctly.

Mr. STEWART: I would like to file with the committee for the information of members an extract from the debates of *Hansard* dealing with a point which arose when Honourable Dr. Motherwell was Minister of Agriculture and the then Conservative Minister of Highways the Honourable Robert Weir—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No, Agriculture.

Mr. STEWART: I was looking at my friend, Mr. Gardiner, I imagine, when I said that.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order; I think the member should read the statement rather than file it.

Mr. STEWART: I did not want to use part of my 10 minutes reading it.

Mr. ARGUE: I think the members should know what is being placed on the record.

Mr. STEWART: It is from *Hansard* and I will give you the reference, but I don't want to read it. You can look it up and follow it for yourself. It is taken from *Hansard* of 1932-33, volume IV, pages 3761-3763.

Mr. ARGUE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman; I object to any member bringing in any document and asking that it be put on the record without reading from that document.

Mr. STEWART: If I get another 10 minutes, I will be glad to read it.

The CHAIRMAN: That would fair.

Mr. ARGUE: I think we should allow him another 10 minutes. I think we should have this material on the record at this point, although it might be easier to get it from *Hansard* as it takes just about two weeks for us to get the printed record; and that is the main reason why I suggest that we should know what is being placed on the record.

Mr. STEWART: I would be pleased to do that if you allow me extra time.

Mr. ARGUE: We would not be able to look it up for ourselves without a lot of research.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, as I understand it from what my honourable friend is saying, he is just going to refer to something which is already in *Hansard*?

Mr. STEWART: Yes, in *Hansard* of 1932-33.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: So that if Mr. Argue is not going to insist that it be printed in the record, you can look it up and read it. If it is going to take up too much time to read it he can give us the reference from *Hansard* so we can look it up for ourselves.

Mr. ARGUE: The Chairman has indicated he would give him (Mr. Stewart) extra time to read it.

Mr. STEWART: If I am going to be allowed extra time in which to read it I will read it.

Mr. SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would move that it will be tabled.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a motion by Mr. Sinnott that a copy of this debate be tabled. All those in favour?

Mr. SINNOTT: Tabled, and printed in the record.

Mr. ARGUE: The motion was that the memorandum be tabled, laid on the table, so that members could see what it is. The motion was not that it be printed in the record.

Mr. SINNOTT: It was to be tabled for the purpose of being included in our report of proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved that this be tabled and printed on the proceedings. All in favour of the motion?

Mr. ARGUE: I would like to amend that by moving that the member for Yorkton read the material to which he has referred—

Mr. STEWART: Providing I get my time extended.

Mr. ARGUE: And that he get extra time.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory, that he reads it?

Mr. STEWART: So long as I get extra time to compensate for reading it.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that Mr. Stewart read it?

Agreed.

Mr. ARGUE: Then, as a preliminary question, could you tell us what the subject under discussion was at the time?

Mr. STEWART: The question of amalgamation came up in the department, as has been suggested here, with respect to consolidating testing in the department and in the field; and the conclusion arrived at by both the gentlemen concerned, Honourable Mr. Motherwell and Honourable Mr. Weir, was that it was not logical.

Mr. ARGUE: What date was that? I hate to interrupt you again.

Mr. STEWART: I gave you the reference.

Mr. ARGUE: What year, did you say?

Mr. STEWART: The session of 1932-1933. The reference reads as follows:

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is they were valuable animals for breeding purposes, they were tubercular, and it was desired to get some heifer calves from them, and by taking the calves from the cows immediately when dropped and pasteurizing the milk, it was thought that they could raise the young stock in safety without transmitting the tuberculosis.

That was a matter that had been in dispute among live stock men and

veterinarians for years and years, and the purpose was to demonstrate whether or not it could be done. It was done for a number of years with safety and success on a farm not far from Ottawa under the supervision of the experimental farm. But at various points, particularly at one central point, outbreaks that could not be accounted for occurred at intervals. The attitude of the live stock husbandman at that time was that it was perfectly safe to conduct that kind of experiment, that there was no danger of transmitting tuberculosis to adjoining herds or other herds by using those animals male or female for breeding purposes. But the veterinary director general took the opposite stand, that it involved too much risk, and he advised strongly that the "Bang" herd be discontinued. Now which point of view should prevail? Running the risk of associating with and continuing the "Bang" herd because there had been no outbreak for a while, or taking the advice of the veterinary director general and playing safe by cutting out the "Bang" herd experiment? At that time we took the advice of the veterinary director general rather than that of the live stock husbandman. Which attitude would my hon. friend have taken? And who would decide such questions under a merger? I am a layman and the minister is a layman as far as veterinary science is concerned. That is the reason I think those two branches should be kept separate. Both points of view are held conscientiously, but with such dissimilar viewpoints they are bound to differ at important points of contact.

Mr. WEIR (*Melfort*) (He was the member for Melfort at that time.) With reference to the first question, my hon. friend would not think I would be so discourteous as not to answer or attempt to answer his question; I did not think he really asked a question. If there was any question it was this: In case a decision had to be made with reference to isolation or precautions against diseases what would be the correct procedure? I would say that there could be but one answer, that the decision of those qualified to do that work, the veterinary scientists, should prevail.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Now, in this case, you are absolutely satisfied, and the veterinarians associated with you, that this disease was not the infectious disease, foot and mouth disease until away on in February?—A. That is correct.

Q. That is correct?—A. Yes.

Q. And that was the unanimous opinion of all these veterinarians there, whether they were provincial veterinarians hired by the provincial government or by yourselves?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There was never any dispute between you and the provincial veterinarians in connection with this disease at all?—A. At no time.

Q. You have perfect cooperation with the provincial veterinarians and yourselves?—A. Yes, there has been the most amicable relations existing between the provincials and ourselves.

Q. On many occasions, doctor, you have had occasion to discuss this matter with the deputy minister, Mr. Horner, out there?—A. Yes.

Q. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture under the present Saskatchewan C.C.F. government?—A. And Mr. Brocklebank and the provincial veterinarians.

Q. And you have also had some discussions with Mr. Brocklebank who is, I believe, a brother of Mr. Brocklebank the Minister of National Resources in Saskatchewan; he is the brother of the man you mentioned?—A. I think so.

Q. I know him; well, he is a very good man—provincial—I believe his job is director of the livestock bureau and the provincial veterinary branch—Mr. Brocklebank's brother.—A. I consider that Mr. E. E. Brocklebank is a very fine gentleman.

Q. And that Mr. Brocklebank whom I mentioned at no time questioned the steps you were taking in connection with the prevention of this disease?—A. No, at no time.

Q. And in fact I believe he was complimentary to you about the preventative measures that were being taken by you and the federal department, you and your associates, in preventing the spread of this disease?—A. In fact within a few days I was called down here and he came to my office, he came to my office every two or three days when this disease was confirmed as foot and mouth disease, and he has remarked on more than one occasion that he thinks we are doing a good job; he could not think of anything more than we are doing; and we have discussed the thing from every angle. He has been perfectly satisfied with the way we are carrying on the work there.

Q. And he is still satisfied as far as you know?—A. Yes; also the provincial veterinarian has been very cooperative and he is satisfied with the way things are going.

Q. And the only dissatisfaction you have heard is from the politicians down at Ottawa? Is that correct?

MR. GOUR: That is pure bull.

THE WITNESS: I can say, sir, that most of the people in Saskatchewan say that you gentlemen are wasting a lot of time down here, and they still say that.

HON. MEMBERS: Here, here.

MR. STEWART: I think it is only fair that you should be getting back to your work, the work that you are doing so well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, and then Mr. Quelch.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Dr. Christie, were you connected with the department since 1937 and 1938?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you been continuously at Regina?—A. I went to Manitoba on field work in 1937 and 1938.

Q. You are aware of an outbreak—were you then doing any field work on stomatitis in Manitoba in 1937 and 38?—A. Yes, we did some. In fact I only visited one of the cases myself; and also I read about it in Saskatchewan. I believe that was around 1934. I am not certain. I know there was one which I read about in Saskatchewan and I believe that it was in 1934.

Q. And you would be aware then, at that time, that samples of the virus of that stomatitis were sent to the laboratory in Hull, at that time, for examination?—A. I cannot say that I remember samples having been sent in at that time. I know I did not. From the ones I saw out there I know that no samples were sent.

Q. We had information given to the committee the other day by the minister that in that outbreak in 1937 in Manitoba where you were present that samples were sent to the Hull laboratory for testing.

RIGHT HON. MR. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of privilege; if you are going to give the information which you mentioned you should give all of it. The information, of course, was that nobody out in the field knew anything about it except the director general who went out and got the samples himself and brought them back. Nobody even knew a thing about it.

Mr. WRIGHT: The point is that there was an outbreak of stomatitis in Manitoba in 1937. You were there as one of the field men who had direct contact with it, and there were samples at that time sent to the Hull laboratory for testing and those tests proved at that time that it was stomatitis.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. It did not occur to you then that a similar procedure should be followed in Saskatchewan in 1951 when you had a similar outbreak of stomatitis there at that time?—A. No, not being aware of samples having been sent in from Manitoba.

Q. That report of these samples being sent in was in the minister's report of the House in 1937. He reported here to the committee—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: In 1938.

Mr. WRIGHT: 1938, yes; of the samples having been sent.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. You agree that vesicular stomatitis is very similar to foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were all the proper tests taken when vesicular stomatitis occurred in Saskatchewan around the 1st of December to determine whether it was in fact vesicular stomatitis or a more dangerous disease?—A. Well, we inoculated horses. Now, looking back, I would say that we should have probably gone further and had more animal inoculations made.

Q. What is the proper field test to determine—A. To take?

Q. —that it is stomatitis or some dangerous vesicular disease?—A. Well, taking these specimens from infected animals and inoculate it into—you can use horses, pigs or cattle.

Q. You say horses, pigs or cattle; did you mean horses, pigs and cattle, to determine the disease?—A. Any of them, you can use any of them for that purpose.

Q. You as a veterinarian then are telling us, the committee, that a proper field test can be made by simply inoculating animals in this area of the type you have mentioned? Did you use them all?—A. No, I did not use them all.

Q. You think using them all is a proper test?—A. Yes.

Q. There was no proper test made then until February with respect to determining whether this was really vesicular stomatitis?—A. We just inoculated the horses.

Q. Did you use the field test to determine the disease in Manitoba in 1937?—A. We made no field test at that time that I am aware of.

Q. You mean that you did?—A. I said that we were satisfied that it was stomatitis.

Q. You say that you were satisfied; you could not have been completely satisfied when samples were sent to Hull.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Again, you are getting off the track. They had nothing to do with that.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, somebody has something to do with it when it came to the minister's attention that samples were sent.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is why I interrupted you.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Despite the fact that the Americans were opposed to this form of examination. You are aware, are you Dr. Christie, that we have a laboratory in Hull for making these tests?—A. Yes, sir. I have attended there.

Q. Did you ever hear of the Americans raising any objections to the establishing of that laboratory on the North American continent? They seem to have very great fear of establishing one in the United States, according to the evidence we have had. Was there ever any question, to your knowledge, raised as to the advisability of Canada establishing such a laboratory in Hull?—A. I am not aware that they have. I know they do not look kindly on these labs on this continent or they would have most likely, with their ability to construct them, would have built one long before this, if they had been in agreement with the idea.

Q. But there never was any objection raised officially that you know of?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On a question of privilege again, Mr. Chairman. My honourable friend objected to the reading from *Hansard* of that very discussion. That discussion was to find out as to whether it was practical to test for Bang's disease in here at a central point or if it should be done in the field; the point being that if it were done here it might tend to spread this Bang's disease.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not raising any objection to that.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: And the decision was not to do Bang's disease. That was one of the things involved.

Mr. WRIGHT: I did not take any objection to the honourable member for Yorkton reading what he did into the record, in fact we were rather pleased that he did read it into the record. The point is that a laboratory was established on the continent here in Canada, and some of the evidence given was that it was in co-operation with the Americans.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Because of our experience we found out that that was not correct. As a matter of fact it is said here in the evidence that the Americans had nothing to do with it, and the United States have agreed to co-operate with us in moving tests over to the island in the St. Lawrence to which reference has been made.

Mr. WRIGHT: Now we are getting some new evidence.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You need a lot of new evidence.

Mr. WRIGHT: And if this stuff is new then apparently the minister is against making a full statement until every last bit of evidence is pried out of him by the committee.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. You say, Dr. Christie, that the sending of samples in Canada would be objected to by the Americans and it might delay the lifting of the embargo. Would you just give us your reasons for that statement?—A. Now, just let me get your question right, sir; we made statements in connection with—

Q. No. My question was, in your statement you indicated that the sending of samples in Canada might result in the Americans delaying the lifting of the embargo against Canadian cattle. Just what is the basis of that statement?—A. Due to the fact that they know the danger in sending these; and, further, Dr. Shahan who came up from Washington didn't act on the first samples that we sent to the lab, not the samples that were sent to Hull, he went out with our men and conducted a test in the field. He was acting on the field test and he did not pay any attention to these other tests. He went right out and inoculated animals.

Mr. ARGUE: And confirmed all the inoculation in the field.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. That was prior to the samples being sent to Hull?—A. No, afterwards.

Q. That was after the samples were sent to Hull?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: One more minute.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. You infer that Dr. Shahan believed that the field test was superior to the proof of the laboratory test?—A. He also wanted field tests, he wanted to see for himself.

Q. Yes, that is the point, he wanted to see for himself just exactly what the reaction was in the field; but I am still intrigued with this idea of yours, that the continuing of the Canadian authority to send virus for examination will delay the lifting of the embargo; just what grounds have you for that statement?—A. Well, I think they will look very questionable, knowing the ideas and sentiments of the American veterinarians I do not think they are taking any more kindly to the sending of these samples than I am.

Mr. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, might I ask—

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, next is Mr. Quelch:

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Just before you do that, that is the same question all over again. I would like to suggest that members ought to listen to the answers to questions they themselves ask.

Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On page 100 of this record Mr. Wright asked a question of Dr. Childs. In the middle of the answer to that question he said this:

I had to leave before all the tests had been completed. One of the first things Dr. Shahan did was to ask for some test animals and make some tests, and that was done.

Now, that evidence was given here before. There is nothing new about it. It was given in answer to a question asked by Mr. Wright, as a matter of fact. You would think to hear him ask it now that he had never heard of it before.

Mr. WRIGHT: I think I heard it at different times, and I certainly have heard him make a very relevant statement. It is only when we repeat these questions and get different answers that we find out through our repeated questioning sometimes it is only in that way that we are able to bring out the correct information.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Quelch.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I think on more than one occasion we have had reference to the handling of this disease to a point which many of us find it very hard to undersand, that is in relation to the inoculation of horses on the Waas farm. We have had a great deal of conflicting evidence on this point. Dr. Mitchell was quite emphatic that in his opinion the only way that you can really make a correct diagnosis as to the disease, as to whether it was vesicular stomatitis or foot and mouth disease, was by the lab test; but on the other hand Dr. Childs, I think it was, told us that he thought a correct diagnosis could be made in the field. And now, in the case of the inoculation on the horses on the Waas farm was that done on your instructions, or was it done on his own initiative by Dr. James?—A. That was done following a discussion by Dr. Carlson, Dr. James and myself.

Q. At that time was there any discussion as to how the tests should be made, as to whether or not the horses would be taken from the Waas herd or from horses obtained off the premises?—A. No, not at that time.

Q. Was there any particular instruction as to how the inoculation should be made?—A. No, not more than the horses, that the inoculation is on the tongue—scarifying the tongue and smearing the infection from an infected animal over the tongue after it has been scarified.

Q. When we had Dr. Mitchell before us I asked him whether or not he considered that what transpired in regard to the inoculation of the two horses was in his opinion pretty conclusive evidence that the animals from which the specimens had been taken had vesicular stomatitis. I also asked him whether in his opinion the horses from the Waas farm should be used or whether they should use horses from other premises. As I understood his reply he said in the first place that the horses should have been taken from farm areas that had not been infected, and in that way they might have made sure that the horses used for the test had not become immune to the disease by having had it on the infected farm. What is your opinion as to that?—A. Well, the idea of bringing in outside horses would be that they would not know whether or not the horses had already been infected and become immune; but the very fact that Dr. James got the reaction he found on these animals proved that they had not previously been infected do you see, it worked just as well as if new horses from outside that area had been brought in. The idea of using outside horses is due to the fact that the animal would not previously have been infected and become immune; but in this case, however, it reacted, so they could not have been infected previously.

Q. You are satisfied that at least one horse did take stomatitis?—A. Yes.

Q. And you said that at that time you felt that the test was satisfactory?—A. Yes, it was satisfactory, because if the horses had previously been infected we would have not got that reaction.

Q. On the other hand, if you had brought in horses from premises outside you would have been more sure of the success of your test?—A. Bringing the animals in would have done no more good because of the very fact which I have explained.

Q. And that applies equally to horses, calves and hogs?—A. And hogs.

Q. And the reason in this case that you only used horses I suppose was that you in your own mind were really satisfied that the disease was vesicular stomatitis and not foot and mouth disease?—A. That is correct.

Q. Would you consider that the failure to diagnose the disease correctly at that time has been partly responsible for the spreading of this disease?—A. Very little, because since we started I think we have stressed that there were 14 premises altogether infected before the disease on the Waas farm was brought to our attention. We had animals leaving the premises that were infected, or people moving going from place to place to work, or animals moving, before we were told about the Waas farm; so that even at that time, if we had diagnosed foot and mouth disease you would still have these 14 infected premises.

Q. How many cases are there that you have been able directly to show that the disease was contracted from the Waas herd or the originally infected herd? Would there be many?—A. Well, there was the outbreak at Weyburn; at the present time we have not been able to determine how it got there. But there was, I think, around close to Regina, 4 premises, farm premises—we don't know how the infection got there. If we had known that we were dealing with foot and mouth disease we might have saved those farms there.

Q. You are still not aware where the original infection came from?—A. No, I am not.

Q. I take it that you are tracing or checking up all possible sources, do you know what all the possible sources are?—A. We have followed every angle that we were able to, every angle that we possibly could has been followed up, all shipments of livestock that have left there, certainly have not been overlooked. There may have been the odd shipment that we had not been made aware of but all we were able to trace we have certainly followed up and we have inspected them on several occasions.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murray.

By Mr. Murray:

Q. I would like to ask Dr. Christie where in his opinion the greatest concentration of population and livestock in Canada is located?—A. I should say here in Ontario.

Q. I am just wondering if he would point out where the greatest concentration of livestock exists?—A. Do you mean by districts or provinces?

Q. Well, the eastern townships, Middlesex County, Carleton County—
—A. Well, not having been down here very often of late years I am not just aware of your most heavily populated areas.

Q. I imagine there would be the greatest density of cattle in Ontario?—A. Yes.

Q. And in no way comparable to Saskatchewan, shall we say?—A. There is no comparison—with all your dairy herds and livestock in Ontario.

Q. And the densest cattle population in America is down around Toronto, Hamilton and those places?—A. I would say so.

Q. Well, it would be very dangerous to bring that virus in here, where you have this densely populated area of dairy cattle, to that part of the country where the population of cattle is the greatest?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinnott.

By Mr. Sinnott:

Q. The question just asked by Mr. Murray was one that I had on my agenda here. However, I should like to quote from a press report, without giving the name—but it says that there were many politicians here in Ottawa who presumed to know more about foot and mouth disease than men like yourself who have had so many years of practice. Is that right?—A. Well, being a modest man, I would not like to say that I knew more about it than they.

Q. Thank you. Now, I am going to ask this question again. It has been asked on at least one occasion. The spread of the disease to eastern Canada is not very likely because of the vast expanse between the farming population of eastern Canada and the farming population in western Canada. Is that right? That is, we have a gap in between there in which there is practically no farming country. Except for that there would be more danger of the virus spreading from the west to the east?—A. I think so.

Q. Yes.—A. That is my opinion.

Q. You have said before, Doctor, that at all times you had the very close co-operation of the department officials in the province of Saskatchewan?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And our next thing would be now that this disease, as it has been intimated now, is pretty well under control, there have been no suspects in the last week—what your department, I suppose, is desirous of doing is to re-open our exports to the United States as soon as possible?—A. Yes, sir. That is what we aim to do as soon as possible.

Q. One more question, Dr. Christie, and I am through. Who do you suppose would be instrumental in obtaining the lifting of the embargo to the United States—what man have you in mind?—A. If you would let me say two men I would say Dr. Childs and the Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Dr. Christie, I notice in Dr. James' report of December 3 referring to the Waas herd he adds that vesicular apthous condition had spread through all animals. What does "apthous" mean there?—A. Well, of course, we know "apthous" means the mouth and I think he probably intended to construe that it was an apthous condition or a sore mouth condition, a mouth condition.

Q. Well, does not "aphthous" mean a foot and mouth condition?—A. No, "aphthous fever" is, not the word "aphthous" itself—that means the mouth.

Q. Now, when this outbreak first occurred, were you notified immediately?—A. Yes, I explained that it was reported to me on Monday morning, December 3, and it was investigated by our Dr. Carlson and Dr. James on Sunday, December 2.

Q. There were 24 in the Waas herd affected out of 34—right?—A. I cannot remember. I have had too many figures to contend with in the last two or three months and I cannot remember all these figures of how many were infected in each herd.

Q. Well, on Dr. James' report he says: "Number of animals infected, 24 out of 34".—A. Yes.

Q. Would you regard that as a serious contagious disease if 24 animals out of 34 were infected?—A. Yes, I would consider that it was as far as stomatitis went.

Q. You immediately then notified Dr. Childs?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you do that by telephone?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your instructions from him were received by telephone?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, when an infectious disease breaks out like that—because it was obviously infectious—isn't it the first thing to determine what it is?—A. We considered that we were determining it and we proposed to Dr. Childs that we would inoculate those horses at that time.

Q. Well, will you tell the committee why you thought it was vesicular stomatitis and not foot and mouth disease?—A. Because no one would have suggested that there was foot and mouth disease in this country and if it had turned out to be stomatitis I would not have been in my present position.

Q. You were afraid of being ridiculed if you made a wrong diagnosis?—A. Foot and mouth disease was out of the question. It had never been in this country, there was none of it in the United States or any part of the North American continent outside of Mexico. They had it there.

Q. Are you satisfied now with the determination that it was originally foot and mouth disease?—A. I think that we were dealing with two conditions. I think we had a mixed infection of stomatitis and foot and mouth disease—foot and mouth disease in a very mild form.

Q. But are you satisfied now that foot and mouth disease existed in the Waas herd from the commencement of this outbreak?—A. I think so.

Q. Foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, this very serious disease existed?—A. Yes.

Q. And you would not do anything about it because you were afraid of ridicule if your diagnosis would be wrong?—A. I was afraid of the effect it would have on the American market if somebody reported foot and mouth disease.

Q. Have you finished the answer to that question?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, foot and mouth disease did exist and you were afraid of the effects on the American market?—A. I was not afraid, but I did not want to take the responsibility of causing hysteria in the United States or in this country.

Q. Now, did you see the minister when he was in Regina?—A. To when do you refer?

Q. Was he there in January?—A. Yes, I believe so. Now, I did not see the minister in January.

Q. You did not see him?—A. No.

Q. Did you see him in February? Don't ask the minister. I am asking you if you saw the minister in January and you said no. I am asking now if you saw him in February?—A. It was in April, I believe, I first saw the minister.

Q. You did not see the minister until April?—A. No.

Q. You did not see him when he was there in February?—A. No, not in February.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: As a matter of fact, nobody was discussing stomatitis when I was in Regina.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Now, have you seen Dr. Mitchell's report on the examinations he conducted in the laboratory?—A. No, I have not.

Q. You are aware of the contents of it, that it was definitely foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I believe that you have a prejudice against this laboratory examination?—A. No, I think it is a very fine institution.

Q. Well, why are you so determined not to have it?—A. Due to the very fact that I explained previously.

Q. Now, would you say that foot and mouth disease was the most contagious disease of anything in the whole world?—A. No, I think rinderpest is just as contagious.

Q. Would you say it is more contagious amongst cattle than diphtheria amongst human beings? We are dealing with a highly scientific matter.

Mr. STEWART: In a very unscientific way.

The WITNESS: I am not a scientific man; I have been a field man.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Well then, are you prejudiced because you are a field man against experiments by pathologists?—A. Not at all. I am prejudiced against the danger of shipping these viruses without someone accompanying them and even then it is dangerous to my mind. I am against that when we can make a test on the spot and decide there.

Q. But, Dr. Christie, you were from December 2 until February 14 and you had not yet decided what it was, don't you see? And you told me at the beginning it was important to make a correct diagnosis immediately?—A. Yes.

Q. And on the diagnosis made by Dr. Mitchell it shows it to be foot and mouth disease right up to February 14, and you did not know it?—A. No, we did not.

Q. How long were you going to take before you were going to make an experiment in the field? How long, Dr. Christie—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Let him answer the question.

Mr. MAJOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, that has been going on all along. These members have been asking questions of the witness and they are doing it in a manner that is leading people to have a different opinion and they are doing it so fast that they are not giving the witness time to give an answer.

Mr. BROWNE: I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, but that was not my intention.

Mr. STEWART: The witness has already answered that by saying that the herd did continue to improve.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. I was asking you, was it not desirable to have the disease identified as quickly as possible and you told me that you did not favour the laboratory test and sending specimens in and that there was a danger of contagion elsewhere and you said therefore you would make the experiment in the field. I

am asking you why is it you did not have these experiments made and the right conclusion found until February 14?—A. We did conduct tests and we also knew of these herds clearing up within ten days—two weeks from the time they were infected these herds cleaned up and went back onto their feed and started producing. This disease was so mild and we did not pretend—I do not pretend to be any more clever than the Americans who in their outbreaks took three to five and six months to determine it after the disease broke out.

Q. But nevertheless, Dr. Christie, you are satisfied now that foot and mouth disease existed there?—A. Oh, yes, and if I had had as good foresight as hindsight I would have demanded that further action be taken to determine the proper diagnosis.

Q. Dr. Christie, the method used for determining the nature of this disease was by inoculating the horses on the Waas farm?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, were you present when that inoculation took place?—A. I was not.

Q. Well then, as the chief veterinarian representative of the government in Saskatchewan, you did not attend the experiments to ascertain what this serious disease was?—A. No.

Q. Why didn't you?—A. Because I had confidence in my men who were working under my supervision. I had no reason to question their diagnosis and the results of the tests that were conducted.

Q. Well, what test did he make?—A. Two horses.

Q. Did he describe to you what test he made?—A. Yes.

Q. What was it?—A. Well, he scarified, as I understand, the tongues of these horses—

Q. He what?

The CHAIRMAN: Let him finish answering, please.

Mr. MAJOR: That is why we do not know what is going on. You ask him questions and give the answers and do not give him time.

The WITNESS: You are attempting to answer for me.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Will you tell us what he did?—A. Exactly?

Q. In detail?—A. He took the tongue of the horse and scarified it with an instrument.

Q. With a what?—A. With an instrument.

Q. What kind of an instrument?

The CHAIRMAN: Your time is nearly up, Mr. Browne.

Mr. BROWNE: May I ask just one question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, just one more.

By Mr. Browne:

Q. Dr. Christie, are you satisfied that that experiment by Dr. James was conducted in a manner that would be approved by Dr. Mitchell?—A. Absolutely.

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. Just two or three questions I would like to ask. In the first place, do you remember the date when Dr. Wells and Dr. Childs arrived in Regina about the middle of February?—A. The 7th day of February, I believe.

Mr. BROWNE: Now, no promoting over there.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, either date is all right, from my point of view.

The WITNESS: I may say they got in there, I believe, Sunday morning the 17th.

By Right Hon. Mr. Gardiner:

Q. Sunday morning is the 17th. And when were you and the others who were there in conference at that time satisfied in your own minds that you had foot and mouth disease?—A. Well, we were quite satisfied in our own minds when Dr. Carlson phoned. It looked more serious when Dr. Childs and Dr. Wells arrived and we discussed it with them, we were quite certain that we were dealing with something more serious than stomatitis.

Q. That was on the 17th?—A. The 17th.

Q. Then, what did you do on the 18th?—A. Dr. Childs recommended an immediate quarantine be placed surrounding the whole infected area and also made arrangements for procuring some animals from outside the infected area—two hogs and two calves or yearlings, and they were inoculated intramuscularly. I was present when those animals were inoculated.

Q. And you were fairly satisfied at that time that there was a more dangerous disease then and probably foot and mouth disease?—A. Yes.

Q. And what date did the American veterinarians arrive?—A. I think Dr. Shahan arrived there on February 21 or 22.

Q. In other words, your decisions were made or your minds were pretty well made up by that time?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Then, on what date were the investigations of the samples sent down here? What dates were those tested?—A. Well, we got word the 25th, Monday morning, February 25.

Q. In other words, you were convinced that the foot and mouth disease was there before either the Americans arrived or before this test was made down in Ottawa?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And are you sure it was made in Ottawa? Was it made in Ottawa or over on an island in the St. Lawrence, do you know?—A. I am not sure; I don't know.

Q. I think there is some reason for knowing, but nevertheless it does not make very much difference. It was probably partly carried on at one place and partly at the other. The final report you had on February 25th was after you were satisfied that the disease was foot and mouth. What did the test determine?—A. Determined the type.

Q. And that is really what they did?—A. Yes.

Q. All care was taken to quarantine the whole area before any decisions were made in Hull at all?—A. Yes.

Q. That decision to quarantine the whole of the area was made on what date?—A. The 18th.

Q. It was made out there on the 18th? It was made here in council on Wednesday the 20th.

Mr. ARGUE: That was after the samples were sent?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Yes, but before they were tested. And as a matter of fact, the whole diagnosis of the disease was made apart from what the tests tell us.

Mr. CHARLTON: On a question of privilege. It has been stated here in the committee that they were satisfied in the Hull laboratory that it was foot and mouth disease on the 17th or 18th of February and Dr. Mitchell was so advised.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Oh, no.

Mr. ARGUE: I move we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn subject to the call of the chair.

The committee adjourned.

APPENDIX A

Answers by Dr. James to Questions Submitted for Answer by Mr. Wright

Question 1.—

Will Dr. James comment on why the balance of this carcass was allowed to be distributed to the trade? (This refers to carcass of bull referred to in report of Dr. James dated January 4.).

Answer—

It was the opinion of the inspector in charge that the remainder of the carcass was fit for food since condemnation of the head was for Stomatitis.

Question 2.—

Has the first cow mentioned in this report been traced through the ear tag number?

Answer—

It was not ear tagged but originated district south of Rouleau. All livestock in this district has been examined by inspection veterinarians.

Question 3.—

Has the herd from which the bull came from been destroyed?

Answer—

Herd not destroyed but has been examined and found free of disease.

Question 4.—

Is this herd in the neighbourhood or have persons who were in contact with this herd been on any of the farms recently infected in the Weyburn area?

Answer—

From inspections made and interrogation, it can be stated that there is absolutely no connection between Bessflug herd and Weyburn centre of infection.

Question 5.—

What is the result and report of the veterinarian who visited these premises adjacent to the Weyburn sub-district?

Answer—

All premises adjacent Weyburn infection examined by inspection veterinarians. All premises other than where livestock slaughtered free of disease.

Question 6.—

What was the date bull was slaughtered?

Answer—

January 3rd.

Question 7.—

What were the geographic bounds of the Weyburn sub-district in January?

Answer—

Weyburn sub-district in January consisted of Rural Municipalities numbers: 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 96, 97, 98.

APPENDIX B

Answer to Question by Mr. Wright

Question—

Would you please advise the approximate number of permits issued in the Regina office for the movement of livestock, meat, and hides?

Answer—

Livestock, 1,132; Meat, 588; Hides, 164.

HD
1781
A38
1952
No. 8

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

No. 8

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1952

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, May 28, 1952.

Ordered,— That the following Bill be referred to the said Committee:—
Bill No. 246, An Act to amend The Canada Grain Act.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1952.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Studer be substituted for that of Mr. Stewart (*Yorkton*) on the said Committee.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Welbourn be substituted for that of Mr. Gardiner on the said Committee.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Ferrie be substituted for that of Mr. Decore on the said Committee.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Ward be substituted for that of Mr. Kent on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, June 16, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11.00 o'clock a.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. A. J. Bater, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Blue, Browne (St. John's West), Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Dinsdale, Fair, Ferrie, Gauthier (Lapointe), George, Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kirk (Digby-Yarmouth), MacKenzie, MacLean (Queens), McCubbin, McWilliam, Murray (Oxford), Quelch, Ross (Souris), Sinnott, Studer, White (Middlesex East), Whitman, Ward, Wood, Welbourn, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Right Hon. J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, and Mr. J. G. Taggart, C.B.E., Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

The Chairman announced that the name of Mr. Studer had been substituted for that of Mr. Stewart (Yorkton) on the Sub-Committee on Agenda and Procedure.

Moved by Mr. Hetland, seconded by Mr. Wood; That, as sufficient evidence has been taken and witnesses heard, concerning Foot and Mouth disease, the Sub-Committee on Agenda and Procedure prepare a draft "Report to the House" for consideration by this committee; and that the said draft report be considered by this committee (in camera) as soon as possible.

Mr. Wright moved in amendment thereto: That all the words after the word "That" in the first line be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

before a report is submitted to the House the following persons be called before this Committee:

Dr. Hewitt, Constable Sherman, Manager of Burns Plant, and the Caretaker of Animals kept for Breeding Purposes at Exhibition Grounds in Regina.

Discussion continuing thereon, at 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 3.00 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 3.00 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Blue, Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Darroch, Dinsdale, Fair, Ferrie, Gauthier (Lapointe), George, Gour (Russell), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Kirk (Antigonish-Guysborough), Kirk (Digby-Yarmouth), Laing, MacKenzie, MacLean (Queens), Major, McCubbin, McWilliam, Murray (Oxford), Quelch, Ross (Souris), Sinnott, Studer, White (Middlesex East), Whitman, Ward, Wood, Welbourn, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Right Hon. J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, and Mr. J. G. Taggart, C.B.E., Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Hetland's motion and the amendment thereto of Mr. Wright were further considered.

By leave, Mr. Hetland reworded the main motion to read as follows:

That, as sufficient evidence has been taken and witnesses heard concerning Foot and Mouth disease, the Sub-Committee on Agenda and Procedure prepare a draft "Report to the House" for consideration by this committee; and that the said draft be considered by this committee as soon as possible.

The question having been put on Mr. Wright's amendment it was negatived on the following division:

Yeas: Messrs. Argue, Bryce, Charlton, Dinsdale, Harkness, Jones, Ross (*Souris*), White (*Middlesex East*), Wright.—9.

Nays: Messrs. Anderson, Bennett, Blue, Corry, Darroch, Fair, Ferrie, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jutras, Kirk (*Anti-gonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, Major, McCubbin, McWilliam, Murray (*Oxford*), Quelch, Sinnott, Studer, Ward, Whitman, Welbourn, Wood, Wylie.—28.

The main motion was carried on the following division:

Yeas: Messrs. Anderson, Bennett, Blue, Corry, Darroch, Fair, Ferrie, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jutras, Kirk (*Anti-gonish-Guysborough*), Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Laing, MacKenzie, Major, McCubbin, McWilliam, Murray (*Oxford*), Quelch, Sinnott, Studer, Ward, Whitman, Welbourn, Wood, Wylie.—28.

Nays: Messrs. Argue, Bryce, Charlton, Dinsdale, Harkness, Jones, Ross (*Souris*), White (*Middlesex East*), Wright.—9.

The Committee agreed to meet this evening to consider the report of the Canadian Wheat Board.

At 4.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 8.15 o'clock p.m. this day.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee

EVIDENCE

JUNE 16, 1952

11:30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Now, gentlemen, my reason for calling this meeting today is that I have been in consultation with the Right hon. Mr. Howe who advised me that he would be ready to go on tomorrow with the Wheat Board officials. They will be on hand to commence on the report of the Canadian Wheat Board. Therefore, I thought that this morning we might possibly clean up the investigation in connection with foot and mouth disease.

There has been a change in the personnel of the committee since our last meeting and Mr. Studer will replace Mr. Stewart on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. Now, gentlemen, the meeting is open at your pleasure.

Mr. HETLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by Mr. Wood, "That, as sufficient evidence has been taken and witnesses heard, concerning Foot and Mouth disease, the subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure prepare a draft 'Report to the House' for consideration by this committee; and that the draft report be considered by this committee (in camera) as soon as possible.

Mr. Ross: Mr. Chairman, with respect to this motion, as far as I am concerned, I do not think we have received sufficient evidence. And I have never been associated with a committee in the House of Commons which blew up, so to speak, in the fashion that this committee on agriculture did on the 13th of May. I was a member of the steering committee and I requested that Dr. Christie be heard before this committee because he was the senior field man and it had been intimated by other members representing the government on the steering committee that we should call witnesses again as well as Dr. Christie. I understood he was in town for about 3 days, here in Ottawa. He was heard on Tuesday the 13th, yet a number of us did not have an opportunity at all of asking a question of Dr. Christie on that day.

The meeting rose and you said we would meet again at the call of the chair. And I immediately asked you, Mr. Chairman, when that might be, and if we could have Dr. Christie here again. And then I went to the Minister of Agriculture and asked him if he would have Dr. Christie here for further questioning, and he said that Dr. Christie was needed out in the field at that particular time, and that he had already made other arrangements.

Then on the following day Dr. Christie was still in town but we did not have a meeting. Therefore I do not see how this committee is now in a position to make a popular report. The thing just blew up. Therefore I do not see how this committee can make a popular report without hearing further evidence. There were other members who had questions to ask Dr. Christie, which would have had a bearing on this whole situation there in the field at Regina from the outbreak, and also to prove or disprove the evidence of other men working with him, or under his instructions at that time. We did not have an opportunity to call some of the others to verify the evidence we wanted from Dr. Christie. And then in addition there was a request that independent witnesses be called.

All who were questioned were members of the Health of Animals Branch, but there was a request that we hear a private veterinarian who had been active in the field work out there, and also that we should hear evidence from a member of the R.C.M.P. who had been there on the ground in connection with

the quarantine. But we never had an opportunity to hear any of them, or any other independent evidence outside of the officials of the Department of Agriculture. Therefore I think in fairness to the membership of this House, before it endeavours to prepare a report—and I think there should be a report to the House on this matter—that we cannot possibly consider a report without hearing further from these independent witnesses as well as from Dr. Christie. This committee is not in a position to proceed on the motion of Mr. Hetland at this particular time in view of these facts. I think it was a most unsatisfactory situation that we simply folded up as we did, and I think it would be even more unsatisfactory if we attempted to make a report on this very serious epidemic in view of what evidence we have received, because we certainly have not received sufficient evidence. There is no argument about that.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words to what Mr. Ross has said, although I shall not repeat what he has said about Dr. Christie. Dr. Christie was here in Ottawa and he could have been heard by the committee if you, Mr. Chairman, had seen fit to call the committee, and brought Dr. Christie before us to complete his evidence.

There are other witnesses who should have been called, independent witnesses, other than those who had to do with the Health of Animals Branch. I do not know Dr. Hewitt personally. I have never met the man. But when this committee met and his name was mentioned and the name of his assistant, as having dealt with this disease, I wrote to Dr. Hewitt on May 3 in the following words:

Dear Dr. Hewitt:

As you are no doubt aware, there is at present an investigation by the Agricultural committee of the House being carried on with regard to the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Saskatchewan. To date, we have had Dr. Taggart, the deputy minister, and Dr. Childs as witnesses before the committee. Next week it is proposed to have Dr. Carlsen, Dr. James and Dr. Wells from Regina. In talking the matter over with my colleagues on the committee, we had thought it would be advisable to have a private veterinarian as a witness as well as the various government officials. Yesterday I asked that you be called as a witness.

I hope that you may be able to come down and I am sorry that I was unable to consult with you before having your name submitted for calling. If you have any objections, you might let me know by return mail or by calling me on the phone. I am also having your name placed on the mailing list for all copies of proceedings of committee so that you may be able to follow what is taking place.

In reply to that letter I had a 'phone call from Dr. Hewitt saying that he would be prepared to appear before the committee. I had no further communication from him until May 20 when at that time this committee, or the sub-committee, had reached a decision, or an apparent decision, that Dr. Hewitt was not to be called. He wrote me then to this effect:

I do not know if any member of the agriculture committee can make use of information not given by a witness, but I herewith give expression to a few facts and ideas that I believe should be considered.

In the first place, the disease was discovered by a young veterinary practitioner by the name of Doctor Harold Hunter who was fully alerted to the gravity of the situation, and advised the owner that it might be "foot and mouth" disease. That was on December 1, 1951, late in the day. The next day was Sunday. He called me on the 'phone describing what he saw and said to the owner. I advised him to promptly notify Doctor Carlsen; as the Health of Animals office was closed on Sunday, and I believed

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We are back where we were before. Now, if the honourable gentleman is not ready to table the letter, he is not to read the letter.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, on both a point of order and the question of privilege: the honourable member is putting evidence on the record from a witness whom this committee refused to call. I do not think that is proper; written evidence sent in by some individual on that basis I do not think is proper. As far as I am concerned, I have no knowledge of it. Respecting the other matter, as to whether he should be called or not, the committee decided not to call him, and I submit that we should not now have a written statement from him put on the record.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not certain that the committee had reached a final decision that Dr. Hewitt was not to be called. I do not think the matter was discussed and a vote taken in committee that Dr. Hewitt should not be called.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It was discussed and there was no suggestion from any member of the committee that he be called.

Mr. CHARLTON: As a member of the steering committee I have no recollection of this subject being discussed in the steering committee.

Mr. JUTRAS: It was not taken up in the steering committee, it was taken up in the general committee.

Mr. CHARLTON: The steering committee having decided to refer the matter to the main committee—as a member of the steering committee, at least at no meeting of the steering committee at which I was present, was any decision made on the matter. There may have been a meeting of the steering committee at which I was not present and with respect to which I was not advised.

Mr. QUELCH: In the steering committee the suggestion was made that Dr. Hewitt be called, and it was left with the chairman to get in touch with the Sask. Veterinary Association and other officials concerned and find out whether there was any reason why he should not be called.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Chairman, what I understood at the last meeting—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Reasons were given as to why he should not be called.

Mr. WRIGHT: No, Mr. Chairman, there was no reason given why he should not be called, there was no decision made by the committee.

Mr. JUTRAS: As I recall it it was to be left in the hands of the chairman.

Mr. WRIGHT: The matter of decision was up to the committee, not to the chairman, and that is what we are protesting against. It was suggested that there were one or two other people who should also be called.

Mr. JUTRAS: The honourable member who received the letter should refer it to the steering committee. That is the way I understand it. Isn't that the proper procedure? Of course, I do not know what took place in the steering committee meeting but it seems to me that at that time it was referred back here and that it was left in the hands of the chairman to decide. If that is not correct, then I am subject to correction.

Mr. ARGUE: I believe that at the second last meeting of the steering committee a number of names were suggested. It was subject to the chairman. If he could advance a good reason why Dr. Hewitt should not be called. That is if he had a political axe to grind or personal axe to grind. I for one would not press for him to be called; but the chairman, in my own recollection, did not advance to the steering committee any reason based on personal or political grounds why Dr. Hewitt should not be called; and I for one know of no ground why Dr. Hewitt should not be called; then we asked for details—

Mr. JUTRAS: Then it was referred—

Mr. ARGUE: If you don't mind, please, this is on the point of order. We did ask that Sergeant Sherman of the R.C.M.P. be called, that the manager of the Burns' plant be called, and that Dr. Hewitt and one other be called. That was at the last steering committee meeting. It was agreed that we should go to the main committee meeting and find out whether or not the main committee would allow these witnesses to be called, and that decision was not made by this committee as to whether or not we call any of these witnesses.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, if I may continue:

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, please. I think, in reporting back to the main committee, I did give reasons why Dr. Hewitt should not be called. They were personal, not political. Those reasons were given at the steering committee meeting.

Mr. ARGUE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, your reasons did not satisfy me at the time; and the decision as to what witnesses should be called was left with the main committee and we said we would give to the committee that evidence and we would ask the committee to make the decision.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Chairman, with respect to your statement that you did give those reasons; I think I was present at that meeting of the steering committee just prior to the meeting of the general committee, and my recollection is that you said you were satisfied that he should not be called and Mr. Quelch or somebody asked if you would give us the reasons and you did not care to advance the particular reasons which I thought should be made known to us as members of the committee. I think those are the facts as far as that goes.

The CHAIRMAN: No, I think I did give the reasons.

Mr. ROSS: No, not to my knowledge. You said that you were satisfied there were reasons why he should not be called but you did not advance any of those reasons, to my knowledge.

Mr. QUELCH: The Minister of Agriculture gave us the reasons.

Mr. ROSS: Yes, in the general committee meeting the minister said that he understood that he had been in wrong with the veterinary association of the province.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion that came back from the steering committee was this, "your subcommittee on agenda and procedure met on Tuesday, May 6th, and Wednesday, May 7th and has agreed to recommend that as there are no additional witnesses available before the main committee, the main committee decide whether or not any and what further witnesses are to be called".

Following that we had Dr. Christie.

Mr. ARGUE: That is right.

Mr. QUELCH: I think perhaps someone made a mistake in not getting Dr. Christie to complete his evidence. I am aware of the fact that he was not available. But, coming now to the motion, I doubt very much—

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I don't know—

Mr. QUELCH: I expected you to get up.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I now come to the point on which this matter was discussed, according to report number six, of Wednesday, May 7, Mr. Ross is speaking—

Mr. ARGUE: What page is that on, please?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On page 377.

That the prevalence of foot and mouth disease and its attendant ramifications be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

That was on April 29. Now, in speaking that night I said that I would not want to be responsible for bringing those officials away from

that area if it was going to be necessary and that it would be a hardship to take them away from the situation at that time. However, it was at the instance of the Minister of Agriculture that it was referred to his committee. No one else was urging the matter until they felt it was safe to bring these men from that area.

Then, quite a number of the members of the steering committee were desirous of hearing an independant viewpoint and one name was submitted, I think, Dr. Hewitt, a private practitioner, and after quite a lengthy discussion I think we were pretty well all agreed that it would be well to hear some independent viewpoints from a private practitioner who was not actively employed with the department here and who thought it might be well not to step on his colleagues' toes in this matter. It was agreed then that, subject to certain information the chairman might find out, we would call this veterinarian but that if he had been an employee of either the provincial or federal government or had a political axe to grind it would be fair not to call him.

Mr. WRIGHT: Might I ask you a question there? Was that in the form of a motion and was it passed by the committee—what you have just said with regard to calling Dr. Hewitt?

Mr. ROSS: The chairman will correct me if I am wrong, but I think it was.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: And the majority of the steering committee supported it?

Mr. ROSS: As I have pointed out, with this reservation, that is true, it was carried by the committee last evening. The Chairman will correct me if I am wrong.

Speaking of Dr. Christie, while all the members of this committee do not wish to drag him and his officials away from the field at this time, we are meeting here today to do a job and I am satisfied we have not done it, we have not heard sufficient witnesses yet and despite the fact that we had statements given to the steering committee that the purpose of this committee and the publicity going out from it is very detrimental to the cattle in this country, nevertheless, we are here to obtain information on behalf of the people of this country and as a member of the committee I do not think we have done that.

I do not want to see the committee's deliberations prolonged, but I am certainly very anxious to have Dr. Christie appear before this committee and I think it is very essential in the face of certain evidence that has been given here by other officials that he should be here. He is vitally concerned himself and apart from information we want, it is only fair to Dr. Christie that he be heard here too, in order that he can give his version of certain correspondence and telegrams and so on that have gone back and forth between the headquarters here and the Regina office—fair to the official himself as well as this committee.

I would hope that we would not carry out the motion made here yesterday to close up this committee without hearing from these various witnesses and, as I say, while I do not know anything about this, the other members of the committee wish to have some independent evidence from someone who has been there connected with administration in the field, either prior to the department being called in or since that, and until that is done I do not think this committee has done a job, Mr. Chairman.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, just on the one point, I think in order to get the record straight the hon. member for Souris

made the statement that the committee was called entirely at my instance on this occasion and I just wish to point out it was in spite of me because of certain attitudes that were taken at the time. I took the position as strongly as I could in the House—I might have been mistaken in the beginning in not having stated the rights which civil servants have when the return was called, but my understanding has always been in this House that they have certain privileges when any documents are produced from any department and I did not think it necessary to say those should be adhered to in what was being requested at that time. Therefore, I objected to it being brought down later.

A rather strong attitude was taken by Mr. Diefenbaker and others, and I did the next day say that it would be possible to have a meeting of the committee called the following day and that I would find it most difficult to agree that the files be brought down unless the officials were going to be here to be able to answer at the earliest possible date.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: The hon. minister mentioned me. I never said anything, as I remember, about the committee at the beginning.

RIGHT HON. MR. GARDINER: No, about the bringing down of the documents. Your attitude was towards the bringing down of the documents, that they should be brought down irrespective of what they were, that all the documents should be brought down. I said a lot of them were privileged and should not be brought down and if they were going to be brought down, if the House was going to insist upon having them, I thought the officials should be here to answer at the earliest possible date. I just wanted to point that out, that I at no time agreed and I do not now agree that these men could be spared from the field at this time to answer questions here. I think they were taken away from the field at a most difficult time and they are still being kept away from the field at a most difficult time, in so far as they are brought here.

MR. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, I have never expressed any special desire to have Dr. Christie come down, because we have before us a file with the reports signed by the veterinarians who were actually conducting the inspection and, therefore, that information you might say, is first-hand information and personally I doubt very much whether Dr. Christie could give us any information which we have not already received. But whilst I say that, on the other hand I do feel that if there is a strong desire expressed by a number of members of this committee to have Dr. Christie come down, it would probably be wise to do so. While I say I have no special desire myself to see him called, I do think it would be to the advantage of this committee to have a private practitioner brought down here because some members feel—and I feel that way myself to a certain extent—that perhaps when you call veterinarians employed by the government they might hesitate to make statements before the committee that might embarrass the government. There is that fear in the minds of many members, while on the other hand if we call the private practitioner he will be absolutely free to say whatever he wishes. Whether that will prove to be the case or not remains to be seen, but at least the charge could not be made that we refused to bring down before this committee a private practitioner whose opinions are absolutely free and therefore I am strongly in favour of bringing such a man down.

At the committee meeting last night I decided that Dr. Hewitt should be brought down, provided the chairman did not find out he had a political axe to grind or, on the other hand, had a disagreement with the veterinarian associations.

Mr. WRIGHT: With the veterinarian association or the government?

Mr. QUELCH: No, the western veterinarians association.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: He had a disagreement with Dr. Christie and he was dealt with by the association.

Mr. QUELCH: In what way?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Because of his disagreement.

Mr. QUELCH: Is he still practising? He is still conducting the investigation?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I understand he was up before the board of the association.

Mr. QUELCH: But they did not in any way desire that his services be dispensed with?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: They gave him a talking to, I suppose, as in most of these cases.

Mr. BRYCE: Was that in connection with foot and mouth disease?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: No. Not to my knowledge.

Now, that is what took place. It was discussed here.

Mr. QUELCH: We want to be sure then that this man would be regarded as a satisfactory witness by the veterinarians association and until such time as the chairman actually contacts that association, I do not think really we have that assurance.

Now, the chairman announced that he had been in touch with somebody—I do not know who it was that gave him the information—that there had been some disagreement between Dr. Hewitt and the association, but that is only third-hand. After all, I think it would be better if the chairman would actually get in touch with the veterinarians association and find out whether that association would have any objection to Dr. Hewitt being called. If we call him and if the association says they do not want him called, they would charge, of course, that we brought down a private practitioner we should not have brought down; in other words, that we should have brought down one they recommended, so I think it would be a wise thing for the chairman to actually contact that association and find out whether or not they would be agreeable to Dr. Hewitt being called.

Now, I believe the fact is that both the president and secretary of the association are employees of my department.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well now, Mr. Chairman, I think on the evidence that Mr. Gardiner has placed on the record that surely Dr. Christie, just to be fair, should be called before this committee.

The minister admits that both the president and secretary of the association which had him before them are members of his department.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On a point of order. I am not exactly correct in that. If you will permit me to—

Mr. WRIGHT: Just a minute.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: It won't hurt your argument at all. Permit me to correct that to this extent. I think that one of the officials is an employee of my department. I think the other is a municipal veterinarian who happens to work in Melville.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, indirectly he will be an employee of both the Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan and the federal department in that case. I think there is sort of a joint arrangement between them with regard to municipal veterinarians.

Now, my argument is, of course, that Dr. Hewitt in those stark circumstances certainly should have been called before this committee because Dr. Hewitt states certain things here and if you do not allow me to have this letter read or tabled here certainly it will be handed to the press with regard to the statement which Dr. Hewitt mentions with regard to certain interviews which were held between Dr. Childs and the Veterinarians' Association in the city of Regina during the course of this outbreak.

It is quite evident that the Department of Health of Animals branch were alerted and were told that there should be a further investigation than had already taken place, that what they had done with regard to the inoculation of horses on the Waas farm and other farms was not conclusive evidence.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is putting a whole string of second hand information on the record. Now, I want a ruling as to whether that is in order. The committee, according to what I have read, did not decide to call Dr. Hewitt.

Mr. WRIGHT: Why? Because they are afraid to call him.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The whole discussion took place before the whole committee and no one in this committee moved that he be called after they heard what I have just read. No one asked that he be called at all.

Now, under those circumstances I do not know why we should go on and listen to evidence put on the record from that letter when he is not here to be questioned at all. It is perfectly proper to raise the question as to whether he should be heard but to start to put all of his evidence on record when he is not here that is quite a different thing.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Minister, the matter was left to the chairman of this committee to get in touch with certain people and see whether Dr. Hewitt should be called or not.

Now, I would like to ask the chairman if he has got any written evidence as to whether he wrote the president and secretary of the Veterinarians' Association with regard to whether Dr. Hewitt should be brought before this committee and if he has not then I say he has not carried out his duties, the wishes of this committee as you have read them in the evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not get anything in writing but I used other methods to get the information.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is hearsay. We have had too much hearsay here already.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is not hearsay but what you are attempting to put on is hearsay.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is a signed statement, not hearsay.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the motion before us should be passed until the committee has had a chance to hear any further witnesses that have been suggested and until we have had a chance to complete the evidence of witnesses we have already had before this committee.

I think a grave error was made in the last sitting of the committee when the committee adjourned at the call of the chair and without knowledge of the other members adjourned for a matter of three weeks. There were members here, most of the members of this committee, who had not asked Dr. Christie a question. He was in Ottawa, we have good reason to believe, as late as 11 o'clock in the evening of the following day. For the life of me I do not know why we were not given an opportunity on May 13th to take Dr. Christie's evidence instead of being placed in the position of having Dr. Christie come before us and make so many statements which were certainly hearsay. A lot of his evidence was hearsay evidence on what the American veterinarians were alleged to have said. I think Dr. Christie should be brought back to this committee and we should have a chance to complete his evidence and our questioning.

I agree that Dr. Hewitt should be called but I won't press that now.

We had asked that Constable Sherman of the R.C.M.P. be called because we understood he had made a report, a report that left federal officials in certain places, I understand, in a very bad light.

I do not know if that is the case or not but certainly I think he should have been called. I think we should have an opportunity to hear the manager of the Burns plant. The evidence shows there was disease at the plant on December 18th which was not reported until December 28th. Why was that 10 day delay? We had evidence that the quarantine was lifted there on January 18th, that a number of cattle were slaughtered that exhibited symptoms of foot and mouth disease and subsequently passed for human consumption and so on.

I think we should have the manager of the Burns plant here to find out about all these things.

Mr. HETLAND: On a point of order, I do not think this statement made by that manager should be given here.

That is making a statement that will be passed into channels and he has no right to make that statement.

Mr. ARGUE: That is already part of the evidence. The animals exhibited foot and mouth disease. The heads were condemned and the carcasses were passed for human consumption.

Mr. SINNOTT: It was not diagnosed as foot and mouth disease.

Mr. ARGUE: All right, then, it was diagnosed at the time as vesicular stomatitis. I have one other point to make, Mr. Chairman. I think we should have an opportunity to recall any witnesses we have had, who have appeared to give evidence that is in conflict with certain other evidence, and I refer to the evidence given by the deputy minister, Mr. Taggart—he said that his first knowledge of the disease was on February 2. I have had brought down a return that was tabled in the House of Commons this morning, which shows quarantine orders were sent out and quarantine orders were lifted over the signature of Mr. Taggart, deputy minister, starting back as early as December 6. Dr. Taggart said he had no knowledge of the disease at all when orders were actually going out over his signature dated as early as December 6. I think we should have Dr. Taggart back and find out how he could possibly be sending out orders over his signature concerning a situation of which he had no knowledge until February 2. I think Dr. Taggart should have an opportunity to give an explanation, if indeed there is an explanation that can be given, of the fact that orders were going out over his signature repeatedly, beginning December 6, through December, January, and yet he had no idea that there was a disease in existence out there till along about February 2. I think the way the committee has been handled so far leaves a great deal to be desired. We have had the greatest difficulty getting evidence, getting all the evidence. As I said, just this morning we got some more evidence that shows Dr. Taggart sent orders on December 6 establishing a quarantine. That evidence should have been brought down long ago.

To choke off this committee now leaves this discussion right up in the air, leaves our evidence incomplete and we can only come to the conclusion that there is still a lot of evidence being curtailed.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, just on the procedure. This whole thing originated from the fact that certain correspondence was asked for in the House and at that time, as was stated by Mr. Ross in the report No. 6 that I read a few moments ago, I insisted that if that evidence was going to be brought down, if these letters were going to be brought down, that the officials who wrote the letters should be here at the time they were being considered by this committee. Now, that is the way it got here at all. There

were letters written between certain dates, sometime between November and the 3rd, I think, of March, which were called for under the order of the House, and I said it was unfair to bring those letters and have them discussed here unless the officials concerned would be here at the time they were being considered. That was what was referred to this committee, and I moved that it be referred to the committee and that the matter be discussed here.

Mr. WRIGHT: That was stated in the House before this information was tabled at all; it was decided before that that this matter would be referred to the committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I agreed from the beginning that the whole question of foot and mouth disease would be referred to the committee at the proper time. There is some question as to whether the proper time has arrived yet for that consideration.

Mr. WRIGHT: Quite evidently it is not, as far as the government is concerned.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Just listen a moment and I think you will be satisfied. The suggestion is being made that Dr. Christie remained here and, therefore, could have been heard. That was not the question under consideration at the time the committee adjourned at all. This room was to be occupied that afternoon by some veterans' organization, and, therefore, we could not sit that afternoon.

Mr. WRIGHT: There are other rooms in the building besides this.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: That is the main reason. We went to some of those other rooms and we were not able to get into them. This committee required a big room. That is why we came to this large room as the only proper place to hold a meeting of a committee of such a size as this. The real reason that the committee did not sit again was the fact that there were six or seven of the top officials of the department who had to sit here day in and day out when they should have been engaged in the activities having to do with foot and mouth disease. It was not only the men who were out in the field. Dr. Christie was not as essential to the work as some of the other men who had to be here to answer questions, and if they were not here the questions of members of the committee could not have been answered, and, therefore, it was suggested that the committee's sitting should be held at a later time.

Now, in so far as Dr. Christie was concerned, I think his evidence was entirely satisfactory to the majority of the members of the committee. He was before the committee for two hours and during that two hours the government members, as I recall, took up about 30 minutes and the opposition members took up the remainder of the two hours, 1½ hours, in questioning him. If the proper persons did not question him then that is the fault of the opposition members of the committee and not of anyone else. If they think those who questioned Dr. Christie were not the proper persons to have questioned him, I don't know that we can make much comment on that.

Mr. CHARLTON: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The Minister says that the opposition members took up 1½ hours in questioning Dr. Christie. There were only five opposition members allowed to question, and a limit of ten minutes a piece was put on each of them.

Mr. SINNOTT: You took well over ten minutes.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: They went over their time, if that is true, but in any case all the witnesses that have been called have been called by the government. No one else has called any witnesses at any time.

Mr. WRIGHT: They have asked for them.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: They asked for one or two, and that question was submitted and discussed and it was settled here, I think, to the satisfaction of the majority of the committee. We cannot always satisfy all the committee, but the majority of the committee were satisfied with the decision reached, and no one moved that any other question be considered and another decision reached, so I do not see how anyone can complain at this stage.

Mr. WRIGHT: We will move it now.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You can do so if you desire to do so, but what I say is we feel that the witnesses who have been called have answered all of the essential questions, and that any questions that might be asked or could be asked in addition to those asked are questions which cannot be properly answered or completely answered until all the evidence is in. Now, the evidence is not all in until we are through fighting this disease. We think we have it under control, but if I came here tomorrow and said that it is entirely under control and we are not going to have any more of the disease—we are satisfied with that now—and then if we had a case the next day we would hear nothing from now on but about that case. So I think that the proper thing to do is, if we are going to make a report—and some have said they did not want a report made, that we have not evidence enough on which to base a report. If that is the committee's point of view I do not think we should expect that we could hold a long enough sitting this session to hear all the evidence needed, but I still think at the proper time all the evidence in connection with the diagnosis and the fighting of foot and mouth disease should come before this committee, but the proper time for us to meet is when all the evidence needed is available. We are still fighting the disease and I think the proper time to have this discussion that is talked about is later on.

I could give other reasons as to why I think that now, but I do not think it is necessary to give them. I think members of this committee fully understand them. We have not the same pressures for them. I think we can quite properly allow this committee to make some report to the House which would indicate that we have heard evidence; if we have not heard enough then we can say so, that we want to hear some more. Until we have heard all the evidence there is no final report that we can make, but we can make some other report to the effect that we have found certain things as a result of carrying on the investigation. I do not think we are going to get very much further than we have got by calling, at random, witnesses now, such as a veterinarian called in by somebody to attend the case.

I have got some reasons for not wanting to have some people called, because I do not want to have to make the accusations that some people have made against them, and I think we should first have all the evidence before we start to make accusations. I think that if the evidence is not all sound—and remember, I am not talking about the officials in the department, but about some of the others that some have suggested be called here—I do not know, but I think it would be all right to call them in due course, but I think we should know a little more about them than we do at the present time before we call some of them.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, I think we should have allowed Dr. Christie to complete his evidence at the time he was here, because he stayed in Ottawa two or three days after the meeting. Then, I think we should have called Dr. Hewitt or some other independent witness just to stop the kind of criticism which is now being made. Apparently some of the members from Saskatchewan felt that he would have given evidence to the effect that he had warned that the disease might be that of foot and mouth disease; but even if he had done so, I do not think it would have very much effect on the kind of report we are going to draft.

In my opinion, the thing for this committee to do is to decide whether or not everything was done out in the field; secondly, to decide whether or not there had been any negligence or carelessness in handling the outbreak, and if there had been, to decide whether or not as a result of that carelessness, there had been an unnecessary spread of the disease; and then finally, in our report we should make any recommendations that we see fit as to any future outbreak of a vesicular disease and how it should be handled.

I think we have had enough evidence to deal with those points. I doubt if anything would be gained at this stage by calling any further evidence. We have a number of matters to be dealt with by this committee and we are getting near the end of the session. Therefore I think we should be winding up this matter of foot and mouth disease as soon as possible so that we can get on with those other questions.

The point in which I disagree with the motion is that the report of the recommendation of the steering committee be considered in camera. I do not think it should be considered in camera, but rather that it should be considered in the open. A lot of publicity has already been given to this committee, and therefore I think it is just as important that publicity be given to the report of the committee and to the considerations raised at the time the report is being considered by this committee.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, along with Mr. Quelch, I, too, cannot see what other evidence at this stage could help to change the situation any; but I would like to correct the record. When the member for Souris made a statement that the committee blew up before this, I think it was a most inaccurate expression to use because, as a matter of fact, the committee did everything but blow up towards the end. And if I remember correctly—and I remember very vividly the last meeting we had when Dr. Christie was before us—there was no great anxiety on the part of any members of the committee, when the committee rose, to ask him any questions. There was no immediate desire expressed at that time that they wanted to question Dr. Christie further.

Mr. BRYCE: You want to check with the chairman, Mr. Jutras.

Mr. JUTRAS: I am talking about what happened in the committee, not outside the committee or any other place. At any rate, there was no great anxiety at that time, and I know the record bears me out.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is an entirely wrong statement.

Mr. JUTRAS: When we heard Dr. Christie, we had heard all the logical witnesses that had to be heard or that we had in mind to hear at that time. The only other possible evidence mentioned by some members of the committee was that of this one independent veterinarian, and the R.C.M.P., and a United States official. I think the United States official finally was cleared out. It was found—and I think everybody agreed—that there was no point to be served in calling an American official.

We come to an independent veterinarian, but I cannot see what purpose would be served by calling an independent witness here, particularly the one who has been mentioned. To begin with, if he merely repeats what the others have said, it won't add anything to the evidence; and if one private veterinarian—can you imagine one private veterinarian coming here and disputing or refuting the professional arguments of all the other veterinarians who appeared here?

I know that I, for one, if I were to hear an independent veterinarian come here and challenge the knowledge and the professional experience of his fellow colleagues, I would have some doubts of his reliability as a witness. Then we would have to call other witnesses; in that case we would have to call more independent witnesses; and if we got a contrary opinion from a second witness,

then it would be said that it would not be fair to have one against one; therefore we would have to call more witnesses, and in the end, what could you get out of independent veterinarians like that? It would just be a waste of time, and we cannot possibly have any controversial evidence in that way. I doubt if any professional veterinarian would publicly challenge the professional knowledge of all his colleagues in a situation like that.

Mr. WRIGHT: No one has suggested that he would.

Mr. ROSS: There must have been a difference of opinion between the two groups.

Mr. JUTRAS: No, there has been no difference of opinion among the witnesses who have been here.

Then, with respect to the R.C.M.P., they are purely administrative; they merely enforce the rules and regulations as laid down by Dr. Childs. Dr. Childs appeared before this committee and he gave answers to all the questions which were asked him; and the chairman, before the meeting was adjourned, asked if there were any questions from members of the committee yet to be asked, or if they were satisfied that they had asked all the questions? It was decided to adjourn, because there were no further questions to ask him, and all his evidence was on the record. Therefore I see no point in calling the R.C.M.P., and I doubt very much, apart from that, the wisdom of calling a constable here to testify before this meeting, and also with respect to the United States official. There is a difference of opinion on whether there has been sufficient evidence taken so far to make a report. That is a matter of opinion, but I for one feel, and quite sincerely and truly, that we have all the evidence we could possibly have at this stage. It is all on the record and I feel we certainly can make a report to the House. The motion is quite clear, and I am sure that the majority of the members of this committee feel the same way at this stage, that there is very little to be added, in spite of what some of the hon. members of the committee might say. And I should add that recently, just over the week end,—and no doubt members of the committee must have seen it in the papers—there was a statement made by an organization in the United States which has to do with this problem, that they have full confidence in the way this matter has been handled, so far in Canada, and they have nothing to recommend. After all, the American market is the important consideration in this matter at the present time. And I think if we are in a position—and we are in a position to make a report to the House, then this is the time to do it.

So far as Dr. Christie is concerned, he appeared here just as did all the other witnesses and he was subject to cross-examination by members from all the parties.

Mr. BRYCE: No. He was not here long enough.

Mr. JUTRAS: I repeat that some of each party had the opportunity to ask questions; everybody had an opportunity, and some from each party, to ask questions.

Mr. BRYCE: There was not time enough.

Mr. SINNOTT: Because you took too long yourself.

Mr. JUTRAS: He did appear here the same as the others. All the evidence is on the record and this is just going back over old ground. I feel that the motion at this stage would be in order.

Mr. CHARLTON: Dr. Hewitt's name has been brought out here, and I think he should have an opportunity of appearing here before the committee. I do not know what you did, Mr. Chairman, to find out if the association had anything against Dr. Hewitt. I think that it would be fair if we find out because, since the association has been brought into it, since the name of the

veterinary association has been brought into it, I think it is only fair to him that his name should be cleared, that he should be given an opportunity to clear himself, particularly in view of the circumstances. The Minister of Agriculture has made the statement that the president and secretary of the association are employees of the department. I rather doubt if the president is an employee of the department, but I believe the secretary is. I think you, Mr. Chairman, should state for what reasons you arrived at the decision that this particular veterinarian should not be called so that we could hear his evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blue:

Mr. BLUE: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I do not think that this discussion which is going on here this morning is adding anything to the welfare of Canada, particularly in the way it is being carried on here this morning. I for one am not making statements for political reasons, and I think this committee should be closed for the good of the people of Canada. I say we are taking too long in the discussion of this matter, particularly what has taken place here this morning which is nothing as it will only serve to delay the opening of the American market. But with regard to what has taken place ever since the opening of our proceedings today I feel that we are not contributing anything to the education or edification of the people of Canada. After all, this disease is pretty well controlled now, and on that point I think there will be practically unanimity, particularly with regard to those people who are responsible and who have come here. Personally, I think they are among the most qualified men in the world. I think we should be satisfied to base our report on the evidence given to us by them. I do think we as representatives of the Canadian people are not doing anything for their cause by the sort of repetition we have heard here this morning, and I think the time has come when the motion which has been moved by Mr. Hetland should be put.

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Chairman, I might say that I have attended all the sittings of this committee since it was started, and I have listened to all the witnesses who have given evidence. We listened to Dr. Christie for three hours give his very good evidence; and I believe that not concluding these sittings at this time will not serve any good purpose; the only purpose it could serve is to allow members to wash more dirty linen; and I for one am not anxious to come back to these meetings and listen to that sort of talk. I think the motion should be put. I am of the opinion that further sittings of this committee would serve no useful purpose at this time.

Mr. ARGUE: The member has said a lot of things which are apparently not too clean.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I rather resent the statement that certain members of this committee have dirty linen to clean; some may have dirty linen to hide but not to be cleaned.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: The honourable member should not make an insinuation of that kind.

Mr. SINNOTT: Well then, less dirty linen.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, the reporter can't get that when you are all talking at once.

Mr. WRIGHT: From the information which I received afterwards I believe that the department have done a really good job since February 17 or 18, when they finally decided it was foot and mouth disease. I am making no accusation nor implying in any way that a reasonably good job was not done from the time it was actually diagnosed as foot and mouth disease. Before that, I definitely feel that there was laxity. Whether as a committee we are interested in that or not, I do not know; apparently a majority are not; the government members do not appear to be.

Mr. SINNOTT: That statement is not fair. Unless the honourable member is willing to lay a charge he should withdraw that statement.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not withdrawing anything.

Mr. BRYCE: Well, you brought it on yourself.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, I do think with regard to that evidence that it should be produced. In the House when we asked for the tabling of a certain report made by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police the minister said that he did not believe that the report should be tabled but he stated then that the constable could be called as a witness before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: And nothing has been said to the contrary.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Jutras just now made the statment that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were only in this to carry out instructions with regard to taking care of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease. As a matter of fact, this report was not made until it was recognized that it was foot and mouth disease, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were asked to go out and make an investigation over the area, to visit the different farms in the area to see if there might have been earlier than December some sickness in the herds which might have been foot and mouth disease.

Mr. SINNOTT: Who were they asked by?

Mr. WRIGHT: They were asked by the government.

Mr. SINNOTT: Well, by which government?

Mr. WRIGHT: A Constable Sherman went out and made a survey, I do not know whether it was just around the Regina district or further.

Mr. SINNOTT: But who were they asked by?

Mr. WRIGHT: I suppose by whoever was responsible.

Mr. SINNOTT: Well, go on tell us.

Mr. WRIGHT: The federal government, I suppose; I don't mind answering.

Mr. SINNOTT: There is a government in Saskatchewan as well as the federal government and that is why I asked you, which government.

Mr. WRIGHT: Whoever was handling—

Mr. SINNOTT: Let us have the answer.

Mr. WRIGHT: I said the Health of Animals Branch of the federal government. I suppose they are the people who were responsible for contagious diseases such as foot and mouth disease. He made a survey and his survey indicated certain things and I think that should be of interest to this committee. That information has been asked for but the government members don't want to hear it; but, what did they make a survey for if there was not some purpose behind it. I think that the constable should be called, and I am going to move an amendment to the motion by Mr. Hetland that before a report from this committee is submitted to the House the following witnesses be called: Dr. Hewitt, Constable Sherman, the manager of the Burns' plant in Regina, and the caretaker of the animals kept for breeding purposes at the exhibition grounds in Regina. I think that those are the people principally interested in following up the outbreak of this disease. And the reason I am asking that is that we may have another outbreak, and I think we should establish some reasonable procedure for the immediate detection of such an outbreak. I think an examination into the mistakes made if any were made before February 17 should be of interest to this committee. As I said before I have nothing to say against what has taken place since February 17 when the disease was definitely diagnosed as foot and mouth disease. I think the department have done a reasonably good job since that time, but in my opinion that does not absolve them from any slackness, and I think that slackness should be penalized, that the people in the department should be—

Mr. SINNOTT: Should be fired?

Mr. WRIGHT: Absolutely; because if I am correct—and I am saying this, that we have not enough evidence at present to prove as to whether I am correct or not—until that evidence is submitted to this committee, I do not think the committee has done its duty.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Wright) seemed perfectly clear that we need further evidence. One thing at least is clear to me with respect to these veterinarians and that is that you cannot call just one private veterinarian and get the story through him, you will have to call quite a number of private veterinarians, all those who may have been concerned with this outbreak of foot and mouth disease.

Mr. WRIGHT: There were only two or three of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, there must have been a hundred.

Mr. SINNOTT: I think that you will find that there were some 60.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, the point is that you cannot call one without calling all. It does seem to me that there is no useful purpose to be gained by carrying this on any further because a final report has to be made; and, after all, the situation is nearly cleaned up; so I am in favour, since we must make some kind of a report this year, that it should be in the nature of an interim report, and that a final report should be deferred to another session.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment moved by Mr. Wright. I do not know that I agree with the statement that there is not enough evidence in now to decide whether or not the officials in the department should resign.

I am not going to mention any names but I think there is evidence that points to the worst possible kind of negligence and I think, as the evidence now stands, that certainly there is evidence that somebody should resign and I am not going to mention any names.

The minister said the majority of this committee are satisfied. Well, probably the majority are satisfied but we opposition members as a group are not satisfied that we have all the evidence and the evidence that should be brought in and I think for the majority members to choke off the discussion and to prevent the minority members, the opposition members, from asking further questions is not fair and I do not think the motion should be pressed.

As I understand it, if I am right in my interpretation, this committee was set up to inquire into the outbreak of foot and mouth disease and all its attendant ramifications.

When the committee was here, about the first day, I believe, I asked, I think it was, Dr. Taggart about floor prices and how they were working out. Well, it seems to me at this point, as I have said two or three times already, the main thing the agricultural producers are interested in is the economic effect of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease and certainly they are most interested in the floor price that are established and how they work out. We all know that those floor prices have not worked fully effectively since they were inaugurated. I believe there has been a definite improvement recently but as recent ago as less than a week I had a farmer bring a receipt to me of a stall fed young cow—I do not know if you would call it a heifer or not but a cow—

Mr. SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, what has all this got to do with the business before this committee or the amendment. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want a ruling on that. What has all this got to do with the evidence before us or the sub-amendment? It is political propaganda, nothing but.

Mr. ARGUE: I have heard that kind of loose talk from the member before.

Mr. SINNOTT: You have given lots of it too.

Mr. ARGUE: The motion before the committee is that we wind things up and make a report. What I am saying is before we make a report we should have the opportunity to discuss the floor price established as a result of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease. I think that is something that the committee should look into, the matter of how the agricultural producers are coming out looked at in the light of past history.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: How long do you think that would take? Are we in a position to do that this session? Maybe it is something that ought to be done but could we do it this session?

Mr. ARGUE: I think if we had three or four sessions I think we could do a lot.

The CHAIRMAN: I think floor prices are entirely out of order right now.

Mr. ARGUE: The motion is that the committee be folded up and I wanted to make it clear that at the last session of the committee, if this is the last session, that I have been pressing for a discussion on floor prices as I did at the first session.

Then, there is another point I think we should discuss that I think is definitely connected with this and that is the compensation that has been paid to farmers whose livestock has been slaughtered. I asked Dr. Wells when he was before the committee if he thought farmers were satisfied and I believe his answer to me was that as far as he knew with the exception of farmers to the number of fingers on I don't know whether it was one or two hands, they were satisfied.

We have had resolutions signed by a number of the farmers whose livestock has been slaughtered saying that they were not satisfied. It was stated in the press that a number of farmers who have received compensation were not satisfied. Well, I think we should have an opportunity in this committee to learn the formula by which compensation has been paid and to learn of any grievances which exist because if there is anything important to cleaning up this disease, to the discovery of the disease when it breaks out, it is that the farmer whose livestock is slaughtered should be amply compensated and there is certainly no evidence before this committee in that regard.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I have not been a member of this committee until this morning and I had not intended saying anything until Mr. Argue and Mr. Wright just made their statements.

I just came back from my constituency last Wednesday. After all, we do regard public opinion as having some bearing upon government in this country and upon the things we do here. I talked to a number, not all Liberals either, of my constituents about the evidence before this committee. Some of them have been reading the reports of this committee. One good old Conservative said this to me: "What are you fellows doing down there?" I said "What do you mean?" He said "Those political propagandists before the committee (and he named four or five of those members of the committee who, according to the evidence he said had done infinitely more damage to the livestock industry of this country than the foot and mouth disease). In fact, he named three or four sitting right at that table there.

This Tory member knew them and he said: "Those fellows ought to be ashamed of themselves—the injury they have done to the livestock industry by this continuous propaganda has been almost enough to destroy it."

Well, I started to do some thinking and as I went around the constituency for three or four days I talked to a number of people and I did not find one, single solitary person who had followed some of the evidence of what went on here who did not have the same condemnation of the political propaganda

before this committee. That is the thing that is keeping the press running in this country, talking about foot and mouth disease such as what I heard from the member for Assiniboia here and that is what is causing a great injury to the livestock industry in this country and I am amazed because it was my own view sitting in and listening in here when I was not a member and listening to these political propagandists who were doing infinitely more damage than all the foot and mouth disease in the province of Saskatchewan. The foot and mouth disease could not have done nearly so much damage as the political propaganda before this committee.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time these men came to their senses, became seized of the true effect and influence of the propaganda that is going out of this committee day by day.

I think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was absolutely right in his thought that this should never have come before a committee. That is not the way they did it in the United States in the last outbreak they had over there. It never came before Congress; they did not discuss it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time that we did something towards closing off this debate. Whether it is the right thing this morning I do not know but I think we should do something to stop this propaganda going out which is injuring the livestock industry in Canada.

Mr. Ross: Mr. Chairman, I certainly listened with interest to everything which the member for Dauphin was stating and to the Minister of Agriculture on this committee. I am not able, though, to follow his argument further or the argument of Mr. Blue that this committee has done any harm to the livestock industry. I represent some of the best cattle people certainly in the province or in the west and I am just as much concerned as anybody else and I have been also talking with some of my people and certainly there are different kinds of opinions.

But I want to come back to this point: "In giving the terms of reference calling this committee to deal with this subject, the minister stated that members of his staff were going to be on trial as a result of the correspondence and other facts that were going to be tabled in answer to a return in the House of Commons.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: As a result of what was being said, not as a result of the correspondence.

Mr. Ross: I have not got a *Hansard* before me, but it was distinctly said that members of his staff would be on trial.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I read it this morning.

Mr. Ross: Then it is true, is it not? The point is they were on trial, and the evidence that we heard was conflicting evidence. Conflicting evidence was given by some of the senior officials of the Health of Animals branch of the department and so far we have not had an opportunity to clear those contradictions up and prove, or disprove, which of those officials were right. We started in to do a job and rightly or wrongly there are people who claim this should not have been discussed in an open committee such as we have done, but, rightly or wrongly, we have not done the job yet. The minister said that the majority of the members of this committee have been convinced, but I would like to point out that about 40 of the 60 members of this committee are members of the government. One of the first members here to accuse these officials of gross negligence was a supporter of the government, the member from Springfield. You will see that if you read the evidence. Today, however, he is not so dynamic in connection with this charge as he was in the early stages of the committee. Since then there have been get-togethers of factions of this committee, and some of them have been lined up, because at the second last committee the minister took about two-thirds of the time of our meeting

and my friend from Springfield took the balance, going over several 10-minute periods to keep other members of the committee from speaking at that meeting.

Mr. SINNOTT: I took 18 minutes, to be exact.

Mr. ROSS: Well, whatever time was left, you took it.

Mr. SINNOTT: Now, don't say that.

Mr. ROSS: The point I am coming to is this, that in view of the statement of the minister that members of his staff were on trial, other questions have been raised here about these private veterinarians and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police having to do with the handling of this outbreak at Regina, and I think in the face of the objection made here you are equally doing an injustice to this private veterinarian, because his reputation now is at stake. I think in the face of this statement the chairman should tell this committee where he got his knowledge that convinced him he should not call this veterinarian before this committee. I think it is only fair that he should give the committee the benefit of that knowledge.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Or any other private veterinarian.

Mr. ROSS: Or any other private veterinarian, yes.

Mr. JUTRAS: He is not particularly singled out.

Mr. ROSS: This man's name was singled out and he was discussed before the committee. I was a member of the steering committee, where it was decided we would leave it up to the chairman to find out whether he had any political axe to grind or if there was any reason why he should not be heard.

Mr. JUTRAS: It was left to the chairman by the steering committee, not by the main committee.

Mr. ROSS: I was talking of the steering committee.

Mr. JUTRAS: That does not bind us, the committee.

Mr. ROSS: I say that we have discussed it in this committee—this man's name was discussed in this committee and it was decided in this committee that this man was not a man to be heard. That has become an issue before this committee.

Mr. JUTRAS: That is the responsibility of those who brought his name in, not the responsibility of the committee.

Mr. ROSS: The chairman made recommendations to the committee. I say in fairness to that veterinarian the chairman should tell us where he obtained that information.

Mr. JUTRAS: Well, you should bring this up in the steering committee, not here.

Mr. ROSS: I am now speaking about this amendment. You say we have sufficient evidence to prepare a report. I did claim from the start—I was not one of those who wanted to call before this committee men who were engaged in fighting this disease in the field. I am on record as to that. Again, I must say I am not satisfied we have sufficient evidence. The evidence we have received from the senior officials of the department has been contradictory, and we have not been able to clear those contradictions up. How, then, I ask, are you going to prepare a report at this time? I do not know how, but I do think the House of Commons and the people of this country are entitled to a report on this whole business. From all the evidence I can gather, the officials since February 17 or 18 have done a good job, and I hope they are able to clear this up. It affects me very much. I certainly would like to see it cleared up. They have done a good job so far, but from what I have been able to gather there had been great negligence and some carelessness since the outbreak up to that date, and that is why I was anxious to question Dr. Christie. He was the field man in charge. There was no evidence, I think, from January 5 to February 12,

and that is quite a period—no evidence has been given to clear up the contradictions and to clear up the thought that there was nothing else but negligence during that period. Therefore, I want to question some of the other witnesses. We have not yet begun to complete the job, but I agree with the minister there may be other evidence as to how this was handled, but for the job we set out to do we are not in a position to make a proper report. If you pick out from the evidence of these officials certain of their statements you will see that they have contradicted each other. There is a contradiction in the evidence of Dr. James and Dr. Mitchell, right in the evidence.

Mr. JUTRAS: There is no conflict.

Mr. Ross: There is.

Mr. JUTRAS: It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. ROSS: I am satisfied that there is, and I think in fairness to Dr. Hewitt the chairman should tell us who he consulted and how he decided not to call this veterinarian before the committee.

Mr. FERRIE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words with regard to this. As far as I am concerned, I should know more about the livestock industry of western Canada than any man on this committee. I was 17 years president of the Western Livestock Shippers Association and I have been in contact with these men in Winnipeg, in the packing plants and in the stockyards at Winnipeg, and also all along the line, and I want to tell you without fear or favour that they are absolutely disgusted and this has been a terrible shock to the whole of the livestock industry. This is a billion dollar industry, and I would say to you right now it is time that this matter was closed up, and don't think for one minute that I did not go and ask Mr. Argue, and I asked Mr. Charlton, also, to do that very thing a few months ago. I even went down to his city and said, above everything else if we are going to have the thing done let us do it in the right and proper manner. You fellows know—I will forgive Diefenbaker, but you fellows from western Canada I will not forgive. You are both livestock men and know full well what any disease to that food means to that industry. If you start telling people in the country that there is a disease in that food, how are you going to sell it? That is what I told them. I told them what you are trying to do is to bring this thing out to the detriment of the livestock industry of western Canada. You have had a decision, the decision has been made. You said you wanted these men put on trial. You have put them on trial. You have taken their evidence and the best judge in the world, the veterinarian organization of America, have said that there has never been anything done like it, there has never been anything cleaned up like it on the face of the earth. You can read it for yourself. You do not take anything seriously, everything is a joke to you. As a farmer of western Canada you should get away from that political idea and get down to the facts that we want these things cleaned up and want it kept clean. We want the door open. Here is a man sitting here who states that he has a bunch of heifers and yet he has not got brains enough to keep quiet and let the thing go through. He wants to sell that bunch of spring heifers this fall. How is he going to sell them?

Mr. SINNOTT: Who is the man?

Mr. FERRIE: It is Mr. Charlton, and as far as he is concerned, I say to you that if you have any drop in the livestock industry of western Canada, which is \$1 billion industry, you will know that as long as you keep this going right here, you are going to have people in America and all over this continent saying that they have still got diseased beef in Saskatchewan and in western Canada. You do not need to shake you heads, because it is an answer to facts.

Mr. Ross: I thought it was cleaned up.

Mr. FERRIE: It is cleaned up. So let us clean this up and forget it because, in the first place, if they had done what was right—all right, we will say that it did happen in November. Now, what in the name of Dickens would have happened to our livestock industry all through those two months? Where would our cattle have been? I think we should thank God that it did not happen, and that it went as long as it did, for the sake of our industry. Therefore I say to you and to everybody else "Forget it, and let us pass this motion and get out of here."

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Charlton and then Mr. Quelch.

Mr. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member has mentioned names and heifers, I think personally, I shall just tell him that I have sold about half of those heifers now. No one of this committee or any place else can ever accuse me of playing politics with this very serious matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CHARLTON: I will let the people judge as to who has been playing politics. I am not placing myself hereto be judged by the committee membership. I will let the people outside judge as to who has been playing politics.

Mr. SINNOTT: I think you have done very well in Saskatchewan.

Mr. CHARLTON: And as I said before, I have only tried to find out the facts in this matter, as my duty as a member of a profession which has taken an awful lot of criticism on this whole thing. I think it is very serious when members of that profession, especially those in the employ of the Health of Animals branch, have to take that criticism just because one or two of the top officials—and I am not naming any of them—have been very stubborn. It is not right, and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, again, in view of the fact that the name of one private practitioner has been mentioned here this morning, and the Veterinary Association that in fairness to this one private practitioner as well as to the Veterinary Association you tell us who you consulted, regarding this private practitioner, and to give us the evidence here in order to clear up both the private practitioner and the Veterinary Association.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because I do not think that any good purpose would be served in holding an open session, and for the very reason given by Mr. Argue, because I think there is already sufficient evidence on the record to deal with it. There was a conflict of evidence between that of Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Wells, or at least a difference of opinion as regards the question of diagnosis; but there was a sufficient degree of unanimity between those gentlemen to deal with this question of laxity. And another reason I am opposed to lengthening this question on debate is that we have a lot of important matters to deal with, such as the brief from the Interprovincial Farm Council, and I would like to see the terms of reference broadened to deal with that question.

Mr. SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I will only be two minutes, I will even undertake to be only one minute. I think this agriculture committee which consists of some 60 members will realize that this was the first time that foot and mouth disease ever appeared in Canada and that there was no one in the departments, either provincial or dominion, who had any actual experience with foot and mouth disease. The officers brought before this committee—

Mr. WRIGHT: What about Dr. Carlson? He was in Mexico.

Mr. SINNOTT: The evidence he gave was that he had had no direct contact with foot and mouth disease in his whole experience but arrangements had been made for him to be away for a time to study it. I think the majority of the committee realize and are very thankful for the good job that the officials have done in the field in Saskatchewan. I think they have set a record in dealing with

this outbreak of foot and mouth disease because it was only rampant here for a very very short time; particularly when you consider that in European countries such as England, Scotland and Wales it is still rampant. I think that we should be more than thankful for the efficient way in which they have carried on their job which is going to make it possible to have our export markets re-opened again in the very very near future.

The CHAIRMAN: Could we have a vote before we adjourn?

Mr. WHITE: I would move the adjournment.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by Mr. White that we adjourn. We will meet again at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. HETLAND: Mr. Chairman, before we start, I would like to change the resolution I brought before the committee this morning. I would like to take out the words "in camera". This was agreed to by Mr. Wood. Would you like me to read it without the words "in camera"?

As sufficient evidence has been taken and witnesses heard concerning foot and mouth disease, that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure prepare a draft report to the House for consideration by this committee, and that the draft be considered by this committee as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

Agreed.

Mr. JUTRAS: I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, but the usual practice when a report is considered, is that the meeting be held in camera. At most meetings when the report is being considered, that is the practice followed. But if in this case the report is to be considered or drafted by the agenda committee, I suppose there would be no objection.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

Agreed.

Now, Mr. Bryce.

Mr. BRYCE: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak before when there was some heat in the meeting, but now everything has quieted down, so perhaps I should let sleeping dogs lie.

Mr. SINNOTT: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRYCE: Mr. Ferrie when referring to us fellows over here said that he thought we were doing agriculture a disadvantage by prolonging the committee. Now, I do not think that I can lay claim to being such a good agriculturalist or livestock man as my friend, Mr. Ferrie.

Mr. FERRIE: I did not mention you, Mr. Bryce.

Mr. BRYCE: I thought you did. However, if there are any doubts about what I know concerning livestock, I would ask Mr. Ferrie to inquire about it from the Minister of Agriculture, who is here, and who at one time said that I just loafed around the Winnipeg Stockyards making money out of the rest of the poor farmers who brought cattle in there. That was quite a while ago and I think I am just as good yet, because I have learned a lot since I have come

here and since I have been other places. But to return to the point, and to be as brief as I possibly can, along with my colleagues here I can agree that since the 18th of February I do not think any department could have handled it better than the way in which they have done it.

Mr. STUDER: We heard that the first time.

Mr. BRYCE: I am quite prepared to wait until you speak, you know.

Mr. STUDER: All right, I shall, after you are finished.

Mr. BRYCE: All right, you just keep quiet then. Previous to that, I think there were very good reasons for an investigation and an inquiry, and as the minister has just said, if there was any blame, they would take the blame. Now, the minister told us that in 1938 he took things in his own hands when they had vesicular stomatitis, and he sent samples to Hull, and designated them only as "vesicular stomatitis". He did that. Now, all the argument has taken place on "why was that not done this time?", and all this baloney that we have heard about vials being broken; they are using vials made of cellophane which are unbreakable.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: We are getting back to the old argument again.

Mr. BRYCE: Yes, it is the old argument, but it has never been cleaned up.

Mr. HETLAND: Then why does the United States do it?

Mr. BRYCE: You know what the United States does; they spread hot air all over the place.

Mr. SINNOTT: You would not say that about our neighbours to the south, would you?

Mr. BRYCE: Yes, I would say that about our neighbours to the south.

Mr. SINNOTT: Then that is shameful!

Mr. BRYCE: And I would say that about some who are closer neighbours too. My friend lives only 25 miles from me.

Mr. SINNOTT: I think that is the most shameful statement any member has ever made of the people who have been buying our cattle. You can leave me out of it, I can settle my own disputes; I can fight just as quickly as he can.

Mr. BRYCE: My hon. friend says he stands on his own. Half the statements we get from the United States are hearsay. We never had anybody here from the United States to tell us that; it is all what somebody else said.

Mr. FERRIE: You can read the press.

Mr. BRYCE: What did you say about the press this morning? You said that if these fellows would keep quiet—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. FERRIE: I still say that it is you fellows who got it into the press; it is you who have done it.

Mr. BRYCE: You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. FERRIE: Surely you can.

Mr. BRYCE: My good friend, my neighbour, raised hell at the beginning, but now he is on the other side.

Mr. SINNOTT: No, no, he is impartial.

Mr. BRYCE: We will argue later about that.

Mr. SINNOTT: It is only a matter of opinion.

Mr. BRYCE: I think that we have not got to the bottom of it yet. I think there was negligence somewhere in the beginning. From the very words "after the 18th of February, things were all right, they did a good job up to that time." I think there was something slip shod.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: But it was the same people who were doing it.

Mr. BRYCE: It was the same people doing it, but I think one of them slipped up, maybe two of them slipped up, and they should be reprimanded.

Mr. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, before lunch I rose to say that I am going to support the amendment proposed by Mr. Wright and for this reason: that this seems to me like a trial where we have heard the evidence for the defence but not the prosecution.

Mr. GOUR: That is very possible. Sometimes that is a good way to have it.

Mr. WHITE: Consequently, I am quite prepared to support Mr. Wright, and I think that either now or later, in addition to the names that he mentioned, we should have Dr. Christie, so that we can complete the examination on his statement. He made a long statement that was more or less vindicating the government. There were a few questions I wanted to ask, and I certainly did not get the opportunity to ask them; and a good many others in the committee were in the same position.

Mr. WYLIE: I was here for two hours—at least an hour and a half today—and I listened to all that was said. I think the most sensible proposal that has been put forward is that which was put forward by Mr. Quelch; that the sooner we get rid of this the better. Mr. Quelch is always a very, very reasonable man. I should know him; and that is my opinion. I feel the same as many members of the committee, that we are wasting too much time talking about this matter. After all, if the government was to blame from the second of December to February 17th we can settle that later on. One of the problems we have now is to get the United States markets open; and I have a lot of cattle in my constituency as the honourable Minister of Agriculture knows. I have a larger volume of livestock in my constituency than has the hon. member for Souris. There is no argument about that. But what we want to do now is to recognize that the less we say about foot and mouth disease the better. I read the report which was referred to by Mr. Jutras this morning, and the United States feeling is that the government has done a good job since this outbreak was diagnosed as foot and mouth disease. After all, what else can you do? The more time we waste around here talking about foot and mouth disease the harder it is going to be for the western livestock producers. We all realize that.

Mr. BLUE: And the eastern fellows too.

Mr. WYLIE: I am surprised that some of the eastern members got into the argument the way they did because this condition does not affect them so much.

Mr. BLUE: Oh, yes, it does.

Mr. WYLIE: I will admit that it does in a way, but the Alberta Department of Agriculture officials certainly kept their heads.

Mr. McCUBBIN: It not only affects the east it affects Ontario particularly.

Mr. WYLIE: Well, they are a long way from where it was out there.

Mr. McCUBBIN: The Ontario Department of Agriculture followed up all this. They kept their heads and did a good job.

Mr. WYLIE: You had certain restrictions coming into Ontario which we didn't have in Alberta. Alberta is a bigger stock producing province than is Saskatchewan which I think the Minister of Agriculture will know very well, and we were right in the midst of it and we kept our heads there, and it is a good thing we did. We have a lot of stock in the province of Alberta, a lot of stock moves out of our province. You remember that Manitoba and British Columbia put on an embargo on stock going into certain areas and that certainly hurt our livestock industry when there was no need to do it at all. They had the assurance of the federal government, the Honourable Minister

of Agriculture, that there was no danger, yet they put on new embargoes. That is something Alberta did not do and we were sitting right in the midst of it. The Alberta officials felt the same as I did and the same as every Social Credit member of this committee does that, as Mr. Fair said in the House of Commons, the less we say about this matter the better it will be for us. I think that Mr. Fair made one of the best speeches in the House of Commons on this same problem because it does affect each and every one of us and especially the stockmen. We must depend on the United States market. We all know that. As far as calling more witnesses here is concerned, I have heard all I want to hear from the witnesses who appeared before this committee. On the matter of contacting Dr. Hewitt, he is a private veterinarian; but what is he going to tell us? We are going to get back right in the same old spot; and if we call Dr. Christie back we are going to have the same argument over again.

Mr. HETLAND: And the same questions.

Mr. WYLIE: And the same questions; and have all the witnesses and all the evidence over again. I don't want to hear it any more. But I can say this, Mr. Chairman, that no one is more concerned than I am about foot and mouth disease. We are all concerned about foot and mouth disease. But if we call all the witnesses back they will be put through the same questions as all the witnesses we had; they all went through the same questioning. Let's get on with the job. We have other work to bring before the committee. It may be that the dominion government or their officials were lax to start with. Perhaps they were. I think that it is time we realized it; and from now on the less we say about foot and mouth disease the better it will be for the livestock producers of western Canada. So I certainly will oppose the amendment moved by Mr. Wright and I will be very happy to support the motion moved by Mr. Hetland.

Mr. MAJOR: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this investigation from the start and I have not taken up any of the time of the committee. I have listened to the evidence given before the committee and made a note of all the details. I do recollect that from the start there was a strong statement made in the house which would lead me to believe that there was something which was not right in this thing; but as I have heard the witnesses right along these things have all been cleared up in my mind, and from the witnesses which we have had my mind is quite clear as to the statements that were made in the House. I do not know what caused them, but to my mind I am free to think that they were unjustified and should not have been made in the first place. Now, we are told, as we just heard a moment ago, that this thing did not affect the cattle down here in eastern Ontario. I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, it does affect us immensely. In my own province (Ontario) we have a large dairy industry, large numbers of dairy cattle, and to a great extent we depend on the sale of these cattle for revenue, and because of the fact that a lot of our farmers were not able to sell these cattle this spring they have lost very considerable revenue; and as the result of a statement that was made in the House last spring, I would say that a lot of our consumers have been affected. I might mention just one case: the landlady with whom I reside here in Ottawa, would not, because of what has been said about foot and mouth disease, serve any beef, she just would not buy it and would not have it on the table in her home; and that has affected the sale of beef in this section of the country.

Now, I have before me a quotation from the *Ottawa Farm Journal* which I feel sets out the facts in this regard better than I could express them in my own words. This appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* under a date-line, Toronto, May 19th, in which it says: "Agriculture Minister Kennedy of Ontario today returned from an inspection trip to the foot and mouth disease area of the west and said he was satisfied that Ontario is amply protected against an outbreak of the cattle disease".

And further on he says: "I have never in my life seen anything like the clean-up measures that are under way; they may have been slow in starting but it certainly is thorough". And now I am certain that the Minister of Agriculture in our province is satisfied that everything has been done by way of cleaning this up that possibly could be done and I do not think that the calling of one or two more witnesses would provide us with anything better than we have already before us, or that it would clear up anything; and I think the sooner we clean this up and the sooner that we avail ourselves of the position to get our markets back again in the States the better it will be for all concerned, and the more it will help our farmers in this part of the country; and I support the motion that we have no more witnesses.

MR. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, the last speaker has just accused us of causing a decline in the consumption of beef and I made a particular point in the House of Commons and in the committee all along that there were no effects from eating this infected beef if it was cooked. I made a particular point of that so nobody can throw that accusation at me. If the public read the paper they would know there were no ill-effects from eating that beef.

MR. SINNOTT: Everybody does not read what you say.

MR. CHARLTON: I have never at any time criticized what took place since February 18 in this committee or outside the committee. I think the boys out there did a good job from a bad start—a very good job.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this morning I asked you to answer a question regarding the veterinarian association and I want to make it clear that in referring to that veterinary association I had reference to the Canadian Veterinary Association. I do not know whether you were referring to the Canadian Veterinary Association or the provincial association. I would like to have that clear and I would like you also to answer the question, the question I asked this morning regarding whom you consulted regarding the private practitioner in order that his name be cleared.

Are you going to answer the question? Well, the assumption is that you took your own judgment rather than the veterinary association whom you were supposed to consult.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I did not.

MR. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, that is a question that can be answered yes or no. Did you consult the veterinary association and which association did you consult?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I did not consult them directly.

MR. CHARLTON: You did not consult them directly?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. HARKNESS: I would like to make one remark before we vote on this. There seems to be a very naive assumption on the part of some members that if we quit talking in this committee about foot and mouth disease that the epidemic outside is going to disappear and the economic effects are going to disappear. That is the assumption all those people have got.

Very frankly, it would appear that the outbreak is now under control. I certainly drew that conclusion and I think it is. In fact the evidence is that there has been no outbreak now for a considerable length of time.

Whether this committee continues its investigation as to the circumstances under which this outbreak took place or not will not, in my opinion, have the slightest effect as to the date upon which the American market is re-opened. The date upon which the American market is re-opened will depend upon how effective the American authorities think our control measures were and they apparently have been quite effective and as soon as they are certain that the disease has been checked, they will re-open that market and whether we discuss

the details of the outbreak in this committee or not is not going to have the slightest effect on that question and any remarks from certain members here to the effect that the sooner that is cleared up the sooner we will be back on the American market is so much nonsense. It will have no effect, none whatever and as a result, I think that having started the inquiry it will only be a reasonable and logical thing for us to finish it and pass some considered judgment as to clearing up the matter. As it is at the present time we are left up in air.

We got a certain amount of evidence, a certain amount of conflicting evidence and not having had the opportunity to find out which is the correct interpretation we are still in that position.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, that is the third time today that that statement was made by members of the opposition that we have had conflicting evidence and particularly this morning. The names of Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Carlson, I think, were mentioned in this respect.

The record will bear out that at no time was there any conflicting evidence between those witnesses. There has definitely been no conflicting evidence. There has been a slight, on occasion, difference of opinion but that is an entirely different thing than conflicting evidence. Mr. Wright and Scotty there laugh. There is definitely no conflicting evidence.

Mr. BRYCE: You make us laugh.

Mr. JUTRAS: What you say is going on the record that there has been conflicting evidence, that those witnesses did not give the same facts and that is unfair to the witnesses because all the witnesses that have appeared here gave the same facts. They disagreed on occasion in the matter of professional opinion but in the matter of facts, the facts that were presented were the same presented by all witnesses. That can be found on the record.

Mr. CHARLTON: I hate to mention it but I wonder what the member would say when he reads the evidence concerning the Saskatchewan rats.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into an argument—

Mr. CHARLTON: To make it more specific, one witness said rats will take the disease and the other said they would not.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not going to get into the argument with regard to whether the evidence is conflicting or not. The evidence is there to be read by the people and I am sure the public will be able to come to their own conclusions from it. Apparently we differ but that is not a matter I am going to go into at the moment.

I just want to refer to one statement made by Mr. Quelch when he said that we should get on with our business, that we had these people before the committee and the calling of these witnesses would interfere with other business. That is not necessary at all. If we did call witnesses again it would be at least a week before those witnesses could get here, I am quite sure, and I am sure that the evidence which we will hear from the Wheat Board and the Board of Grain Commisisoners will be cleared up by that time so I do not think there is any sound argument that hearing these other people should interfere with having other evidence before this committee.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, I went beyond that; I suggested that it could be possible if we have spare time to broaden the terms of reference we could deal with the submissions in this brief. I think we will not be dealing with that until we get wider terms of reference and I think we would be better employed doing that than rehashing this whole thing.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would agree with Mr. Quelch that the terms of reference with regard to this submission should be widened and I will assist him towards that end. I do not know whether we will be successful or not.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put it was suggested here this morning by one or two that members of the opposition have been using this committee for political propaganda purposes and that they have hurt the livestock industry. I want to deny that very emphatically. As far as I am concerned I have never at any time attempted to use this committee in any way for any propaganda of any type, political or otherwise; I have only attempted to get the facts from the witnesses.

Mr. FERRIE: You do not mean to tell me that you are that ignorant.

Mr. ARGUE: I would not want to put myself in your category.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I agree with the statement that has been made that anything done in this committee has or will affect or will likely affect the lifting of the date of the embargo in the United States, not in my opinion anyway. I think that embargo will be lifted after the period that the disease has been cleaned up and if I have not already made the statement I want to agree with the others who said that since this disease was diagnosed as foot and mouth disease well on in February that every precaution, as far as I know, has been taken and there has been the greatest co-operation so far as I know between provincial veterinarians, federal veterinarians and I think they are doing a grand job.

Now, I was out in Saskatchewan in the last week or so and we saw some of the things they were doing in southern Saskatchewan. In fact, they are disinfecting everybody including the politicians travelling on the highway there. I got disinfected at the disinfectant stations half a dozen times or more and as far as I can see they were doing a good job and as far as I could hear they were doing a good job but I do not think that anything any member of this committee has been inquiring into as to what went on between the early part of December and the middle of February has in any way hurt the livestock industry and I think if this inquiry results, as I believe it will, in the officials of the department being more on their toes in looking for various contagious diseases, that it will have served a useful purpose so I certainly will support the amendment.

Mr. SINNOTT: I just want to add that the officials who carried on the stamping out of the disease after February 15 were the very same officials who were there since the start of the disease.

Mr. WRIGHT: There were a lot of men sent out from Ottawa who were to take charge and who did a good job there.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I do not think we should let unreliable information get onto the record. Exactly the same officials have conducted the stamping out of the disease as were carrying on during the time that the diagnosis was made. There was only one man who went out from here who is in that class at all, and that is Dr. Wells. Now, Dr. Wells was in charge here if not out there during the previous period, too. He is one of the men actively engaged. If I had not been on my feet I would not have got on my feet to say this, that there is only one thing involved, and the question is whether our men did it the same way as the Americans do it. There is no other question involved, and they did do it the same way, and my hon. friend from Brant argued in the beginning that was the correct way to do it.

Mr. CHARLTON: I did not say it was the correct way—I said it could be done that way.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: And it has turned out it was the correct way.

Mr. CHARLTON: It could have been done that way, too, if it had been done correctly, but when the minister says the same officials were in charge here as were in the field, that is untrue.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Dr. Wells is in charge.

Mr. CHARLTON: Dr. Wells is not in charge in Ottawa. Dr. Childs is over Dr. Wells in Ottawa.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Dr. Wells is Dr. Childs' assistant, and he is still Dr. Childs' assistant when he is out in Regina.

Mr. CHARLTON: The minister made the statement in committee that Dr. Wells was in charge of the clean-up in Saskatchewan. That is in evidence before the committee. Now, will the minister say that Dr. Wells is in charge at Ottawa?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Dr. Childs is in charge of the whole operation of the branch. Dr. Wells is his assistant, always has been right through the whole period of the diagnosing of the disease and through the fighting of the disease, and he represents Dr. Childs at Regina in handling the disease. Now, the situation has not been changed at all through the whole picture. The same men are in charge now. There has been no change in anybody since this started. The same men are in charge now as were in charge at the beginning. I want to emphasize this, that there was no divergence of opinion about the question as to whether they should have followed the same system both in diagnosing and fighting the disease as they did in the United States and every American agrees, and everyone who has come before this committee agreed they did. There was one official who appeared here who had some doubts about the system they follow in the United States and the system we follow here—but there was no divergence of opinion—it was agreed that we did follow the same system as the Americans right through in diagnosing and everything else, and that is the important fact, and the most important fact.

Mr. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let that statement ride. Dr. Mitchell in Hull definitely stated that the proper procedure would be to send samples to Hull. All I can do is to liken this thing to an operation for appendicitis being carried out on a kitchen table, with a hospital next door.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege. That is just exactly what I said. I make a statement and the hon. member gets up and repeats it and says it is different from what I said. I just got through saying that Dr. Mitchell made that statement. You are denying what I stated. I say that Dr. Mitchell disagreed with both the Americans and our people as to what was the proper system, but he did agree, and so did everyone else, that we followed the American system both in diagnosis and treatment of the disease, wiping it out. That is the important thing because it is the American market we have to get back into. We followed their system throughout.

Mr. CHARLTON: There is one reason the Americans cannot follow the system we follow here, and that is because the Americans, as has been said here, the Americans have not that lab. They have now appropriated \$10 million to build one. They see the error of their ways and are going to try to copy ours. For goodness sake if we have something to brag about let us brag about it instead of knocking people down.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Let us clean the whole thing up while we are at it. When I was out west I made a statement to the press, which was subsequently corrected some and put in the form in which I stated it. We did not consider here, either in the department or outside of it, that the proper place to diagnose this disease was at the laboratory in Hull. The diagnosis was not carried on at Hull, it was carried on at Grosse Isle in the St. Lawrence, and as far as we are concerned that is the position we take, and that is where it will be carried on if it is carried on at all.

Mr. WRIGHT: Dr. Childs while he was in the office was opposed to having samples sent to Ottawa or to Grosse Isle.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well—

Mr. WRIGHT: And he left his office on his holidays. Within hours Dr. Hall, who was second in charge, had sent a telegram ordering—

Mr. ARGUE: You mean Dr. Hall.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes. Dr. Hall sent a telegram ordering the virus to be sent to Ottawa. So there certainly was a difference of opinion in the department as to the proper procedure.

Mr. CHARLTON: I would not like to say the minister was not correct, but I would say that the statement he made referring to the diagnosis of this being made at Grosse Isle is incorrect.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Well, all right. That is the information I get.

Mr. CHARLTON: Dr. Mitchell did not state that, and as far as I know the diagnosis was made right in Hull. That is where the report was made from.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: But you do not know. That is the trouble with a lot of your statements, you do not know.

Mr. WRIGHT: Then we should have the facts before this committee.

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: You already have them if you read the record.

Mr. WRIGHT: This is the first time I have heard of Grosse Isle.

Mr. CHARLTON: I do not like to see statements go on the record that give a bad impression. Now, Dr. Mitchell has done a wonderful job in diagnosing this disease. The lab in Hull is doing a wonderful job and is continuing to do a wonderful job. I would like to ask the minister this: how would he diagnose rinderpest or pleural pneumonia in the field?

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: I am not a veterinarian, but I am almost as good a one as the member for Brant.

Mr. CHARLTON: There is no possible way—

Right Hon. Mr. GARDINER: And I practised just about as long, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please, gentlemen.

Mr. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, for these two virus diseases there is no possible field test. One of them is more dangerous and samples would have to be sent to a lab to be diagnosed. Now, it is just too ridiculous to say you have a lab there and you don't want to use it.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? I will read the motion. It has been moved by Mr. Hetland, seconded by Mr. Wood, that as sufficient evidence has been taken and witnesses heard concerning foot and mouth disease that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure prepare a draft report to the House for the consideration by this committee, and that the said draft be considered by this committee as soon as possible.

The amendment by Mr. Wright. Mr. Wright moved an amendment thereto: "That all the words after the word 'that' in the first line be struck out and the following substituted therefor: 'Before a report is submitted to the House the following persons be called before this committee: Doctor Hewitt, Constable Sherman, Manager of the Burns plant, and the caretaker of animals kept for breeding purposes at the exhibition grounds in Regina'".

That is the amendment. I will put the amendment first.

All in favour of the amendment?

Mr. WRIGHT: I want a recorded vote on this, by name. Is this the proper place to ask for it now?

The CHAIRMAN: Will those in favour of the amendment please stand?

Will those opposed to the amendment, please stand?

I declare the amendment lost.

All in favour of the original motion as moved by Mr. Hetland and seconded by Mr. Wood will please stand?

Mr. FAIR: That is, with the deletion of the words "in camera"?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, those words are deleted.

Will those who are opposed to the original motion, please stand?

I declare the original motion carried.

We shall adjourn now to meet again tonight, if it is agreeable, at 8:15 when we shall start with the report of the Canadian Wheat Board. I understand that officials are on hand and ready to go tonight.

Mr. Ross: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible for the officials of the Farmers' Union to appear before this committee to present their presentation?

The CHAIRMAN: I have already arranged that for Wednesday, Mr. Ross. It is already arranged by telephone conversation with Mr. Phelps of the Farmers' Union.

HD
1781
A38
1952
No 9

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting the

Report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the crop year 1950-51

No. 9

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1952

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1952

WITNESSES:

Mr. George H. McIvor, Chief Commissioner, Mr. W. C. McNamara, Asst. Chief Commissioner, Mr. W. Riddel, Commissioner, Mr. C. B. Davidson, Secretary, Mr. C. E. G. Earl, Comptroller, Mr. K. C. Aseltine, Asst. Comptroller, all of the Canadian Wheat Board; Mr. J. L. Phelps, President of the Interprovincial Farmers Union Council.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, June 16, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 8.15 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bennett, Blue, Bruneau, Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Ferrie, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Laing, MacKenzie, Major, McCubbin, McWilliam, Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Sinnott, Studer, Ward, Welbourn, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Right Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce; and from the Canadian Wheat Board: Mr. George H. McIvor, Chief Commissioner, Mr. W. C. McNamara, Assistant Chief Commissioner, Mr. W. Riddell, Commissioner, Mr. C. B. Davidson, Secretary, Mr. C. E. G. Earl, Comptroller, Mr. K. C. Aseltine, Assistant Comptroller.

The Committee agreed to consider the report of the Canadian Wheat Board by sections the witnesses answering questions thereon.

The Chairman introduced Mr. McIvor who in turn presented officials of the Board to the Committee.

Sections 1 and 2 were adopted.

At 8.45 o'clock p.m. the Members of the Committee were called to the House for a division.

The Committee resumed at 9.12 o'clock p.m.

Sections 4 to 11, inclusive, were adopted.

At 10.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 11.30 o'clock a.m., Tuesday, June 17.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11.30 o'clock a.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Argue, Aylesworth, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Corry, Cruickshank, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Ferrie, Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jutras, Kirk (*Antigonish-Guysborough*), MacKenzie, Major, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Quelch, Roberge, Ross (*Souris*), Studer, Ward, White (*Middlesex East*), Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Right Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce; Mr. Geo. J. McIlraith, M.P., Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Trade and Commerce; and from the Canadian Wheat Board: Mr. George H. McIvor, Chief Commissioner, Mr. W. C. McNamara, Assistant Chief Commissioner, Mr. W. Riddell, Commissioner, Mr. C. B. Davidson, Secretary, Mr. C. E. G. Earl, Comptroller, Mr. K. C. Aseltine, Assistant Comptroller.

The Committee further considered the report of the Canadian Wheat Board.

The Committee reverted to section 11.

Sections 11-18, inclusive, were adopted.

At 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 3.15 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 3.15 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Argue, Bater, Bennett, Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Blue, Bruneau, Bryce, Cardiff, Charlton, Corry, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Ferrie, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jones, Laing, MacKenzie, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), Murray (*Oxford*), Quelch, Studer, Ward, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Right Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce; Mr. Geo. J. McIlraith, M.P., Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Trade and Commerce; and from the Canadian Wheat Board: Mr. George H. McIvor, Chief Commissioner, Mr. W. C. McNamara, Assistant Chief Commissioner, Mr. W. Riddell, Commissioner, Mr. C. B. Davidson, Secretary, Mr. C. E. G. Earl, Comptroller, Mr. K. C. Aseltine, Assistant Comptroller.

The Report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the crop year 1950-51 was further considered.

The financial statements of the Board were considered, explanations being given by Mr. Earl.

The Auditor's Report was considered.

On motion of Mr. Quelch,

Resolved,—That the Report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the crop year 1950-51 be adopted and that the Chairman report the same to the House.

At 4.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 8.15 p.m. this day.

EVENING SITTING

The Committee resumed at 8.15 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Argue, Bater, Bennett, Bryce, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Ferrie, Gauthier (*Lapointe*), George, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Laing, MacKenzie, McCubbin, Murray (*Oxford*), Murray (*Cariboo*), Quelch, Roberge, Ross (*Souris*), Studer, Ward, White (*Middlesex East*), Welbourn, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Right Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce; Mr. J. L. Phelps, President of the Interprovincial Farmers Union Council and President of the Farmers Union of Saskatchewan; Mr. H. A. Britton, Director, Manitoba Farmers Union.

Mr. Phelps read the brief of the Interprovincial Farmers Union Council and was questioned thereon.

At 10.40 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 11.30 o'clock a.m., Wednesday, June 18.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

JUNE 16, 1952

8:00 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please, gentlemen. I am pleased to announce that we have Mr. McIvor, the Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, with us on this occasion, and I am now going to call on Mr. McIvor to introduce the other officials of the Board who are here present this evening.

Mr. GEORGE H. McIVOR (Chief Commissioner, Canadian Wheat Board); Mr. Chairman and members of the Agriculture Committee. We are very pleased to have the opportunity to appear before this committee once again in connection with the 1950-1951 Canadian Wheat Board Report. We have with us the chief officers of the board, as we feel on an occasion like this we should come properly equipped to give you any information which it is possible for us to give, so I would ask these gentlemen if they would kindly stand so that they may become known to those members of the committee who do not know them:

Mr. W. C. McNamara, Assistant Chief Commissioner; Mr. W. Riddel, Commissioner; Mr. C. B. Davidson, Secretary; Mr. C. E. G. Earl, Comptroller; Mr. K. C. Aseltine, Assistant Comptroller.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, in so far as going through this report is concerned, if it is agreeable to the committee, might I suggest that Mr. McIvor sort of summarize the report, starting in with Part I, and with your agreement would it be agreeable for him to summarize each section of Part I to start in with. We notice there are numbered sections, 1, 2 and so on, and after each section has been summarized by Mr. McIvor it is possible it might be a good time to ask any questions that you desire to ask of Mr. McIvor or any of the officials. Would you consider that a good way to go through the report?

Agreed.

Now, I will ask Mr. McIvor to commence.

Mr. George H. McIvor, Chief Commissioner, Canadian Wheat Board, called:

The WITNESS: Section 1 of Part I of the report is merely a general comment with regard to the world wheat situation in 1950-1951. It takes note of the larger international movement of wheat than in 1949-1950. It makes reference to the good wheat crop in Europe and makes reference also to the production of wheat in Asia. It also makes reference to the crop conditions of the chief exporting countries, the United States and Australia, harvesting smaller crops, but their decreases in production were partially offset by increased production in Canada and the Argentine. It also makes a special comment on the fact that the milling grades of wheat were reduced in Canada, and the figures are also submitted of Canadian exports being 241 million bushels as compared with 225 million bushels in 1949-50.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on section 1?

Carried.

Now, section 2.

The WITNESS: Section 2 deals with the International Wheat Agreement. It refers to the maximum and minimum prices under the agreement. It refers also to the action on September 20, 1949 of the government of Canada devaluing the Canadian dollar and discounting the Canadian dollar in its relationship to the parity of the International Monetary Fund as of March 1, 1949, and as a result the maximum price of wheat under the agreement, which was \$1.80, became \$1.98 in Canadian funds. The section goes on and refers to the fact that this continued until October 2, 1950, when the Canadian dollar was allowed to find its own level on exchange markets, and on and after that date maximum and minimum prices under the International Wheat Agreement expressed in Canadian currency became variable as the value of the Canadian dollar fluctuated in relation to its International Monetary Fund parity. It goes on to give an outline of the prices that existed during the period, and then it states throughout the crop year the International Wheat Agreement selling price for No. 1 Northern Wheat was at the maximum as expressed in Canadian funds. Discounts for grades other than No. 1 Northern were varied from time to time, and it states on August 1, 1950 Canada's guaranteed quantity under the International Wheat Agreement was 215.8 million bushels. Due to accessions to the agreement, increased quantities granted to some importing countries, and adjustments in export quantities as between exporting countries, Canada's guaranteed quantity increased to 221.6 million bushels. Sales of wheat, including flour, under the agreement, however, amounted to 194.7 million bushels. Through the crop year a number of importing countries took quantities of low grade wheat under the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN: Any comments or questions under section 2?

By Mr. Wright:

Q. You say the demand for grades of wheat other than No. 1 Northern sold under the agreement varied from time to time. Just how were those variations arrived at—in consultation with the importing countries or was it decided by the board?—A. It was decided by the board as a result of the competition from other countries in competitive grades.

Q. Were they set by the competitive prices under the open market or the market for class 2 wheat?—A. No, they were set by the Canadian Wheat Board. If we found ourselves in the position where a grade was heavy and difficult to sell, we would reduce our spread. If, on the other hand, the grade was in good demand, we would increase it.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. How low a grade of wheat was sold for milling purposes—down to No. 5?—A. Down to 5, yes, sir. I perhaps should explain that the reason that only 194.7 million bushels was delivered under the agreement was that, as you gentlemen are well aware, a large proportion of our crop was low grade and the importing countries who had the right to call up the full quantity under the agreement decided not to call the low grade wheat.

Mr. FAIR: When you say you sold milling grades down to 5, does that include grade 5?

The WITNESS: Yes, sir.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Apart from the reason Mr. McIvor gave, what importing countries took their quota, or did they all take their quota of wheat?—A. No, there were a number of them who did not take their quota.

Q. Because they could not get high enough grades?—A. That was one of the main reasons given. We did not have the higher grades of wheat.

Q. The importing countries seemed to be living up to the agreement in every way, did they?—A. Yes, several large countries for reasons best known to themselves did not take their full quota. For example, Brazil was an important importer that did not take their full quota.

Q. For what reason?—A. I really do not know, except that Brazil would probably not take No. 5 wheat, but in so far as Canada is concerned Canada lived up to her quota, because we were quite prepared, if they were willing to call No. 5 wheat, to deliver the full quota.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Were there any number of countries which did not take their full quota of the contract grades but bought considerable quantities of the lower grades?—A. There were some and I should explain that in so far as the low grades of wheat are concerned due to the very large quantity of low grades that we had, the price was virtually the same throughout the crop year, so it did not make a great deal of difference to them whether they took it under the agreement or outside, except for the value of filling their quota.

Q. That is the grades lower than the contract grades were approximately the same price under class 2 or under the International Wheat Agreement?—A. Yes, sir, they were.

Mr. QUELCH: In so far as the sale of wheat, you only sell strictly for cash, you do not have to make any financial arrangements, credit arrangements?

The WITNESS: No, sir, we get the cash before we let them have the wheat.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on section 2?

Carried.

Section 3, "The Canadian Position".

The WITNESS: Section 3 deals with the quality of the crop. It points out the lateness of the 1950 wheat crop, the volume of the low grades harvested, the volume of tough and damp wheat harvested, seasonal elevator congestion, and continuing transportation problems arising from the lateness of the crop and other factors. It goes on to say that in selling wheat in 1950-51 the board was confronted with two distinct problems, the first to make limited supplies of milling grades of wheat go as far as possible in meeting domestic and overseas requirements for these grades; the second, to warehouse and transport unusually large quantities of low grade wheat and merchandize quantities which could be disposed of within the crop year. With these circumstances in mind, the board endeavoured to meet domestic and export demands for milling grades of wheat as continuously as possible throughout the crop year, and to the extent that such grades could be placed in saleable positions. The board also endeavoured to take delivery of low grades of wheat as rapidly as country elevator space permitted, and we made a major effort to find and develop markets for these low grades.

The CHAIRMAN: Any comments on section 3?

Mr. CATHERWOOD: Were there any losses on low grade wheat—that is, completely spoiled wheat? Were there any losses in connection with that?

The WITNESS: The losses were so negligible that I would not like to talk about them. They were so very, very small.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. With regard to the movement of grain forward to saleable positions, and with regard to grades and other matters which come under the Canadian Grain Act, are the board satisfied that the present Act is flexible enough and

serves the purpose of getting the wheat into position as quickly and expeditiously as possible, or have the board any suggestions with regard to the Canadian Grain Act or amendments that might assist them in their work?—A. I do not think we have any suggestions, Mr. Wright. I do not know what the particular point is that you have in mind.

Q. Simply that in the marketing of grain today conditions are completely different than they were years ago with our different harvesting methods and trucks and the placing of grain in elevators in large quantities immediately that it is harvested—whether any amendment to the Canadian Grain Act would assist the board in getting that grain forward. For instance, the controller removed the car order book, or part of the car order book. He believed that in doing that he could move grain more expeditiously than under the car order book. Are you people satisfied with that?—A. We fully supported the action of the controller in removing that car order book.

Q. You were entirely satisfied with the Canadian Grain Act as it is presently constituted, when you supported the controller in removing the car order book? That is what I was getting at. Are there any amendments which you believe would assist you.—A. Mr. Wright, first of all I would like to say I think we operate under terrifically abnormal conditions at the present time, and our approach to the Act—and I think I am speaking for other members of the board as well—is that under conditions that are anything like normal the Act works well, but we have had an extraordinary situation, not only with regard to quantities of grain but also with regard to grades, out of condition grain, and in fact almost every factor that would tend to obstruct a maximum movement. Now, in order to overcome that and having in mind that our main objective is to get our grain into world markets and get it sold, we do not think that any local situation should stand in the way of that development. Now, I just would like to submit at this point a figure to the committee to give some idea of the size of job that has been done this year in regard to the movement of grain. We expect that the total marketings of all grain up until the 31st July, 1952, will be 720 million bushels, which I think is the largest figure we have ever experienced in western Canada, and as of the 5th of June the actual marketings were 601.9 million bushels, leaving only 118.5 to come in from now until the end of the crop year, which I think is a major achievement.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I do not like to interrupt here, but we have on the agenda the amendment to the Canada Grain Act, which we are going to reach in two or three days. The Wheat Board will be here then, as it is now, so could we not confine ourselves to the agenda. If we hope to get through this report we cannot discuss extraneous subjects.

Mr. WRIGHT: I thought it might come under this heading of Canadian position, that is the only reason I raised the question. I am perfectly satisfied to discuss it later and I would agree with Mr. McIvor that it was a great achievement to get as much grain moved as they have in the time they did. That is a major achievement, but my only purpose in asking the question was to assist the board or to get information which might assist us later when the Canadian Wheat Act might be before the committee.

Mr. FAIR: Am I correct in saying that the car order book will be restored at the end of July?

The WITNESS: I do not know about that, sir.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is correct.

Mr. FAIR: I thought I had read that.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: It was only suspended till the end of the current crop year.

The WITNESS: I have the order here, issued by the controller, and it is to the effect that it is suspended until July 31.

The CHAIRMAN: No. 3, completed?

By Mr. Argue:

Q. You were able, Mr. McIvor, to develop substantial markets for the low grade grain, the low grade wheat in this crop year?—A. Yes, we were.

Q. And is that continuing so that you have it in a manageable position now?—A. We have had a successful effort this year in regard to low grade wheat. We will have large quantities in the carry-over. We cannot help that, but we have sold large quantities of low grade wheat this year, much of it to new markets.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Mr. McIvor, I would like to ask—at the end of the year a lot of this wheat on which you will have a carry-over—will that have been sold for future delivery?—A. Yes, a good quantity no doubt will be. As I understand your question the wheat that is in the carry-over, will that wheat be sold for future delivery?

Q. Yes.—A. Yes, it will be.

Q. You would not like to say how much?—A. I do not know, frankly.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Would that be future delivery on this year's International Wheat Agreement—that is what you mean?—A. Not necessarily under the International Wheat Agreement at all. It might be sold other ways. On low grade wheat the price is the same so it does not make any difference.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we pass on to No. 4? No. 4, legislation.

The WITNESS: No. 4 deals with the amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act passed in 1950.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. May I go back just a moment? I did not notice—Seasonal Elevator Congestion is one of the headings under this item. We had considerable difficulty on C.P.R. lines in northeastern Saskatchewan as compared to the C.N.R. lines with regard to actual cars both last year and this year.

I think the matter has been more expeditiously dealt with since the controller was appointed but there certainly was a lot of our grain in the northeastern part of the province, of Saskatchewan at least, that should have got to C.P.R. lines and normally would have gone to C.P.R. lines but was delivered to C.N.R. lines because of the congestion and lack of cars on those lines of the C.P.R.

(The committee adjourned for a division in the House.)

The CHAIRMAN: Are we through with Section 3?

Mr. WRIGHT: No, Mr. Chairman. I was in the process of asking a question when we went up to the House to take the vote.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. With regard to seasonal elevator congestion, I had pointed out that in our section of the province there had been considerably more congestion or lack of box cars on C.P.R. lines serving that area than there were on the C.N.R. lines and as a result a great deal of grain which normally should have gone on the C.P.R. was delivered to the C.N.R. lines.

The congestion still exists this year. I know it is not the fault of the Board; it is the fault of weather conditions and a lot of other things but

has the board any information as to whether there is more space available now or annexes being built and would you care to comment on the seasonal elevator congestion which has resulted during the last two years and what steps if any have been or can be taken to relieve the situation?—A. Well, in 1950-51 and also 1951-52 the main problem of the board was the late harvest and the result was there was a matter of five to six weeks loss and railway cars were sitting there and grain was not available to load them. There was congestion at times on the Canadian Pacific and in other areas of the country there was congestion on the Canadian National but the over-all job was the main thing and when we got all through a big job of handling had been done in the face of the conditions.

Dealing with elevator space, the situation in 1950-51 was there were 5,476 country elevators with a capacity of 212 million bushels and annex capacity was 71 million bushels totalling 283 million.

In 1951-52 there was 5,430 country elevators, an elevator capacity of 220 million, the temporary annexes 72 million total 292 million or an increase of 9 million bushels from one year to the other.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Mr. McIvor, is the situation still the same in a country elevator where you are trucking that you can go to Winnipeg and get a certificate from the board to unload at Winnipeg where there is ample room space. Is that still in operation?—A. Yes, it is.

By Mr. Ferrie:

Q. Are you holding all the wheat in the northeastern part of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba for Churchill?—A. We are holding suite a substantial quantity for Churchill.

Q. They were saying that all the elevators were full up there. I was wondering if you were holding any?—A. We are now bringing more wheat to Churchill and, of course, it will be filled shortly but we had a meeting with the railway lines last week and we furnished them with the heavily congested areas which I might say are not large in number when you consider the total number of points.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. Is the elevator at Churchill full now?—A. It is practically full, Mr. Ward.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on No. 3?

No. 4—Legislation.

The WITNESS: This, Mr. Chairman, is self-explanatory. I do not know whether there are any questions on it or not. It deals with the two amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

By Mr. Fair:

Q. That would simplify the work of the board considerably wouldn't it?—A. Very much so.

Q. And also make it very much better for the fellows who are waiting for cheques?—A. Yes, very successful so far as the board is concerned and as far as the producer is concerned.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. In making final payments on a grade basis, does that amendment in 4 mean that that is the amendment that makes it possible for the board to vary the final payment according to grade and what is received for the grade

—am I right?—A. No, it is an amendment that would permit the board under extraordinary conditions to make a payment on certain grades and not on other grades.

Q. It is an interim payment?—A. Or a final payment. It may be that you might find yourself in a situation where you had grades that were not worthy and there was difficulty in disposing of them. As the Act used to read you would have to hold up the whole business until you got them cleaned up; now this enables you to make a payment of special grades if necessary.

Q. Was this amendment used?—A. No, it was not necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on 4?

Carried.

No. 5—Wheat policy.

The WITNESS: I do not think there is anything I need enumerate on that, Mr. Chairman. Again the orders in council are self-explanatory unless there are some questions which someone would like to ask.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What is the floor price under wheat in the Act apart from initial payment?—A. There is not any.

Q. There is no floor price under wheat at all other than the initial payment?—

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The floor price is that if you offer grain you get the initial payment for it.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is a floor price until such time as the world wheat agreement is completed; it is not the floor price—

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: It is a floor price as long as we are offering an initial price for wheat.

Mr. ARGUE: It is a floor price until July 31.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, until July 31, 1953.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. There is actually a floor price so far as the International Wheat Agreement is concerned, a pretty low one?—A. That is correct.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is different. That is a floor price for Canadian wheat sold under agreement; the initial price is a floor price to the producer.

Mr. FAIR: Where it stands today it is almost out of sight.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Right you are. The agreement floor may not be a couple of years from now if we continue to have good crops in western Canada.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. If you make a payment which varies between grades and there are lots of grades, is that much more expensive than the final settlement given at so much per bushel before under the Act?—A. It is slightly—merely a matter of a fraction.

Q. How much per bushel?—A. It is so small I do not believe you could arrive at a figure.

The CHAIRMAN: Are we through with No. 5?

Carried.

No. 6—Crop Development and Wheat Supplies.

The WITNESS: I think, Mr. Chairman, on this one again it is self-explanatory and it just outlines the crop conditions which certainly most of the

members of the committee are quite familiar with and unless there are some questions which I would be very glad to deal with I do not think I need to read it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: No. 6 agreed?

Carried.

No. 7—Export Movement.

The WITNESS: The export movement, of course, shows the division of shipments by monthly exports which, I think, clearly reflects the late crop. You will note in the last six months there was 136·3 of wheat and wheat in terms of flour shipped compared to 104·6 in the first six months.

If you go on with that, Mr. Chairman, you will note the breakdown of exports and I particularly call your attention to the large volume of wheat that the United Kingdom accepted from Canada. This is wheat not including flour. Belgium was the second largest customer, Italy the third, Japan the fourth, India the fifth and South Africa the sixth.

I would also like to point out the very wide distribution of our wheat sales including countries like Tripoli, Turkey and Ecuador—they practically cover the world.

If you go over to the flour column you will find there a very much wider distribution. Again the United Kingdom was the largest taker of flour. Total flour exports in terms of bushels of wheat were 56 million bushels and there you will find that practically every country in the world that can be serviced by flour has been serviced by Canada. The British West Indies, you will note, is our big flour market next to the United Kingdom and then the Philippines, then Italy, Venezuela, Cuba and Hong Kong.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. To what extent are these new markets that we were not in before?—A. Well, Japan, for example, is a definite gain for Canada. Prior to the war Japan took the bulk of her imports from Australia and I would like to call your attention to India which at one time, as you know, was an exporter and they have purchased tremendous quantities of wheat from Canada. I might say the bulk of the Indian shipments and practically all of the Japanese shipments go out from the west coast.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. May I ask what grade of wheat you would sell to India mainly?—A. They won't take anything lower than No. 4.

Q. In the future might this trade be increased, you hope?—A. I would certainly hope so. It depends a good deal on their own domestic production.

Q. Well, India used to be an exporter, didn't she?—A. Yes.

Q. Why is she an importer now?—A. Well, of course, India and Pakistan were divided and Pakistan had a large wheat area. The big reason is the terrific increase in population which has gone ahead by leaps and bounds and India is a tremendous importer of wheat not only from ourselves but from the United States and Australia.

Q. What does Pakistan do with her wheat?—A. I believe she sells some to India.

Q. Does she use Pakistan wheat in connection with our wheat too?—A. No, our wheat goes to India itself—India proper but Pakistan does export some wheat to India and some to other countries as well. All I am trying to say is that in the division of India a large part of the wheat area that formerly existed as being part of the Indian wheat area is now part of the Pakistan wheat area.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Was India the only market that refused to accept low grade wheat?—A. No, there were others. It is not a matter of actually refusing it; it is just a question of being able to use it or not. The difficulty with India is that they distribute their wheat as a whole wheat, the same as they do with rice and they take the wheat and make a small cake out of it which they call "chappatti" (don't ask me how to spell it) and the villagers grind this themselves and I think the Indian people are anxious to have more uniformity in the type of wheat they require. They have taken some No. 5 wheat there—not a great quantity but they have also taken, I am pleased to say, some tough No. 4 from Vancouver.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. In the case of the United Kingdom imports what are the factors which determine whether we sell them wheat or flour?—A. Well, there are usually discussions between ourselves and the United Kingdom Ministry of Food and as a result of these discussions and bargaining, if you wish to call it that, we try to get a maximum quantity of flour sold in that market. And the figure has been fairly uniform over the years ranging from about 350,000 to 400,000 tons. I think that they like to obtain that quantity of flour to blend with their own flour which they grind at a high extraction rate in their own mills.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Do you anticipate having the same kind of discussions for the new crop year?—A. Well, that is one of the things that I will know about by talking to Mr. Howe here before we leave Ottawa.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. To what extent, if any, are sales of wheat to India dependent upon government loans that are, let us say, under the Colombo plan or other assistance plans?—A. This year we did supply some wheat under the Colombo plan.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: There is none as far as this report is concerned.

The WITNESS: No, none as far as this report is concerned.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Is the wheat milled for flour for export bought at the Class II price or the domestic price?—A. It depends entirely if they take it under the International Wheat Pool Agreement or Class II. There is a certain quantity taken under Class II and a considerable quantity under the Agreement.—A. They have the right to either wheat or flour under the International Wheat Agreement.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, we are down to wheat exports by ports.

The WITNESS: There, Mr. Chairman, is an outline of the wheat exports through eastern Canadian ports 91.5 million, Pacific Coast clearance 64.8 and 6.7 from Churchill.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. Do you expect more wheat from Churchill this year than last?—A. We hope so, Mr. Ward. Last year we were up to, I think it was, 7.3. That will go into our next report at 7.3. So we increased by two cargoes this past year. I will put it this way: We are going to do our utmost to increase it above that figure this year.

By Mr. Ferrie:

Q. How many ships have you going in there now, have you any idea?—A. So far arrangements have been made for roughly nine ships so far.

Q. Does that mean that they will make different trips? I was talking to a gentleman the other day and he said he assumed there would be 25 ships in there and that they had had 22 last year didn't they?—A. That is right. I was only giving you the score up to date.

Q. Do they go over to Britain with a load and then come back?—A. Some of them do and some of them take just one load.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. How can movements from the port of export be determined? Isn't that up to the buyer?—A. To a very considerable extent. Last year we were able to sell a considerable quantity of No. 6 wheat through Churchill and it suited the buyer to take it through Churchill and it was a very fine thing for the port because our milling grades of wheat were so short. It is to a very considerable extent buyers' preference but we try as far as possible to move as much as we can through Churchill.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would it assist the use of the port of Churchill, Mr. McIvor, if we were to consider the erection of a terminal elevator in Great Britain so that ships loading out of Churchill could run over and unload quickly into an elevator there and come back while the season is so short?—A. Well, I will answer that question by saying I would much rather sell the wheat to them before it leaves this country. Nobody has ever made any money out of shipping wheat on consignment. I do not mean particularly Great Britain but any other importing country.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What saving is made to the buyer through purchasing wheat through Churchill?—A. It varies. The average saving in 1950-51, I would say, would be about 9 cents a bushel. I will check that.

MR. EARL: I do not think it would be quite that high.

THE WITNESS: I was going to add that we could not get an exact figure on the saving because there are other factors that enter into it and the buyer expects that he will be able to purchase the wheat a little cheaper.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. That is exactly what I was trying to get at. What do you get and what does the buyer get? What is the division of any saving that is made?—A. In 1951 we got from 4 cents to 6 cents a bushel depending on the conditions that existed at the time.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. And who saved that—the Canadian wheat grower?—A. The producer, yes.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Is wheat shipped from Churchill in sterling or in dollars?—A. As far as we are concerned everything is paid in dollars.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. Mr. McIvor, you say the producer would get the benefit of that saving. By what mechanical means is that done?—A. The money all goes into the pool and is distributed to the producers.

Q. That is true, yes, but the actual shipper from Churchill does not get all the benefits?—A. No, that is right.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. That is one of the reasons why I had a special bill on the order paper two years ago to make the port of Churchill a port of delivery under the Wheat Board Act the same as Port Arthur and Fort William and Vancouver. I still hope that the government may consider something along that line because I feel that we people in the northeastern part of the province should have some of that saving or some of the additional money that is made from shipping through the port of Churchill.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Would you pick out the lucky people who are permitted to ship through Churchill?

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, all of the grain in that area should be paid for under the freight rate structure to Churchill the same as the grain in western Alberta whether it comes to Port Arthur or Fort William or whether it goes to Vancouver is paid for under the freight rate structure to Vancouver and any loss that might be incurred as a result of that is a loss to the wheat pool as a whole and not to the producers in that area.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: You object to the producers as a whole getting a little profit out of Churchill, but you are quite willing to have them take a little loss.

Mr. WRIGHT: No. I say the producers in the area adjacent to Churchill should have the same treatment as the producers adjacent to the port of Vancouver, otherwise any savings made are distributed not to producers in that area but to the producers as a whole, and I would suggest that as we ship larger quantities through Churchill, certainly consideration should be given to that condition.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: If we can get to shipping enough wheat in large quantities from that section, we could do that, but we cannot do it under the present circumstances.

Mr. WRIGHT: Have you any figures as to the amount of bushels produced in the area adjacent to Churchill?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I think it is 40 million bushels.

The WITNESS: No, something like 75 million bushels, of which 7 million goes out through Churchill.

Mr. WRIGHT: Most of it is produced in the marginal area, which would have very little effect, or at least the effect would be slight. Another matter in connection with that port is the matter of diversion charges. I do not know whether we should discuss that at this point or not.

The WITNESS: It comes up a little later in the report.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. Are the costs incurred by the movement of this wheat assessed against the terminal or are they pooled?—A. We pay a fixed cost through the terminal, so much per bushel, and we have nothing to do with the over-all costs.

Q. There is no relation then with the terminal costs?—A. None at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall No. 7 carry?

Carried.

No. 8. Transportation.

The WITNESS: No. 8, Mr. Chairman, gives a history of the transportation problem in 1950-51. I have already referred to the lateness of the season and I think most of the members of the committee are familiar with the various happenings with regard to transportation during that year. We have already had some discussion as a result of Mr. Wright's question. If you are interested

in figures, the total amount that was moved in 1950 was 480 millions bushels of all grain, compared to 453 million bushels in 1949-50, in spite of the late harvest.

Mr. ARGUE: Could you give me an explanation as to why the delivery quotas sometimes are removed?

The WITNESS: We have that coming up later.

The CHAIRMAN: We have quotas coming up later on.

Are we through with section No. 8?

Carried.

Section No. 9, Delivery Quotas.

The WITNESS: With regard to delivery quotas, Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose there is any part of the Wheat Board's operations in which we get so much advice and on which there is so much controversy. On the other hand, I think that there is nothing in Wheat Board operations which at times throughout the years has commended itself more to growers than the installation of delivery quotas. Now, considering the difficulties we have had in 1950-51, and the same thing applied this year, the problem was to get forward the types and grades of wheat that we sell, and the only way that we could do that at times was to remove the quotas so that the producers would deliver wheat and we could get it forward to market. In other words, there was no use moving No. 5 wheat when the only demand was for No. 4 or No. 3. Now, then, as a result of that action of the board—and in this we must assume the full responsibility—there were a number of inequities which took place in the country. If nature is kind to us this coming year and we got one year out of three in which we have uniform grades and an early harvest, I am quite sure a lot of these inequities would disappear because we could operate the quota system in a manner similar to the way we operated it previous to this year under discussion. We have had a great many recommendations as to how to operate quotas, and a number of farm organizations and others have made suggestions to us, and I am sure that some of their proposals would not have accomplished anything more than the Board was able to accomplish under the system they followed.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. When you change a quota, when you take it off, for example, at a given point, do you always make it a point to ask the opinion of the local elevator agent at that point?—A. Yes, we do.

Q. Well, there must have been some error some place at some time, because I have checked with different agents—I need not name them—where the quota had been removed and they claimed they knew nothing about it and that the elevators were full when the quota was taken off. Errors like that might creep in, but it created a lot of chaos in the area because a lot of the farmers had not taken any crop in and had to wait a long time.—A. I see my two colleagues over there shaking their heads. My answer was not quite correct, Mr. Argue, and I would like to correct it. Where we take a major action in regard to the removal of quotas or otherwise, we did not consult the elevator agents because our main problem is to get wheat into the market, but we did, say in a general way, consult elevator agents from time to time as to the removal of the quotas.

Q. I am sure the farmers are in favour of quotas and they are also in favour of a small increase in the quota as space becomes available. The board knows the reasons it has for making quotas, or for making a large increase in the quota at one time, but I think it is right to say that at any given elevator marketing point the farmers certainly support the quota system and hope that

when any change is made to increase the quota, that it is made by an amount which will allow the large farmer over a reasonable period to get his grain into the elevator.—A. One of our troubles with the late harvest last year was we did not have sufficient time. We did have to move every bushel possible, otherwise we would have fallen down on our contracts. We did not want to do that, so we had to take that action or we would be discredited as far as contracts were concerned, but I feel sure if we can get a decent harvest and decent grades that you will find a great improvement in so far as the operation of quotas is concerned.

Q. I suppose it is hard to do that from point to point, but when the quota was removed for a period last fall, taken right off, the result was the farmers with good equipment just blocked the elevators solid, and the poor little fellow struggling along could not get his in and had to wait a long time. I think the administration may be difficult, but whenever it becomes advisable to change the quota a moderate increase in the quota might achieve the same result, or might in the matter of a few days of modern harvesting equipment get the local elevators filled without allowing a few people to block it.—A. You give us the grades and we will do our best to meet the quotas.

Mr. FERRIE: I would make the suggestion that whenever you are going to throw that quota wide open if you find that it will be possible to give three to five days' notice, that would give everybody a chance. Sometimes it comes through on the radio in the morning and the first thing you know the big fellow has the elevator filled before the fellow 10 miles out has a chance to get a bushel in. If a notice of three to five days was given, they would be much better off.

The WITNESS: We realize in the action we take at times there are bound to be very severe inequities in the country, but we felt we had to do it to complete our contracts and get the right grades of wheat down to the lakehead or to Vancouver, whichever the case might be, and if we filled the terminals at the lakehead or Vancouver with low grade wheat, we would have stopped the whole movement.

Mr. QUELCH: If there was any pressure from a district, it would be to raise the quota, would it not?

The WITNESS: Yes. They very rarely ask us to lower the quota.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. You do not get much pressure to raise the quota until most farmers in the area have had a chance to haul some wheat on that quota, do you?—A. We do, we get all kinds of pressure in regard to quotas, and it depends a lot on the situation that exists in the local districts, but we of course, I think, can lay claim to the fact that we were the people who started the quota system and it started as a result of the very severe congestion during the war. I think we have learned a good deal by experience, but nevertheless in the last two years I feel that we had to take actions at times the importance of which completely surmounted the inequities that might be created at local points.

Q. No one knows what the grades will be this fall, but if this is a normal year you would not likely have to take the same action as you took the last two years?—A. I cannot promise anything.

Q. But if it is a normal year you would not anticipate having to do that?—A. I do not think so.

By the Chairman:

Q. With respect to quotas, it has been brought to my attention—I have been asked to bring this up, that in order to assist the small operator, the small farmer who does not own combine or threshing machinery, who has to hire

crews and machines to have this done, both the combine and the threshing, and I think that perhaps there should be a minimum quota to assist the smaller farmer who does not own his equipment. I was of the opinion that possibly we should have a wheat quota which would start off at, say, six bushels to the acre and that that should have been reduced to five, with a minimum of 1,000 bushels, but on second thought without reducing the quota at all I thought perhaps we might have had a minimum quota to help the small operator, the soldier who is starting up on a half section and the young farmer who is starting on a small acreage, that possibly a minimum quota of, say, 750 bushels might be set.—A. Well, I think that in regard to any quota policy the No. 1 consideration must be the movement and sale of grain. That must be No. 1. It must surmount every other factor and you might put yourself in the position, Mr. Chairman, in regard to your suggestion, that you were holding space for these small farmers who were not delivering.

Q. No, I would not hold space at all, I did not mean that.—A. How would you make sure they would deliver, then?

Q. Give them an opportunity to deliver up to that amount. A man will, let us say, have 80 acres of wheat. If the quota were to start off at six bushels to the acre, that would only allow him 480 bushels, and if he has got to pay a farmer for combine and threshing operations he will not get sufficient out of his quota to pay the expenses.—A. I am trying to visualize the picture at the local point. You have perhaps one man who harvested grain and has it ready for delivery, and another man who has not harvested, and he is one of the men you are referring to. What are you going to do, hold that space at the elevator until such time as he can get machinery to harvest and deliver his grain?

Mr. FAIR: Mr. Bater's plan would be to give the fellow with the small acreage, whatever it might be, a higher quota than the fellow with a bigger acreage.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right.

The WITNESS: Well, the only thing I can say to you is that we will be considering our quota system before the new crop is moved and I assure you we will take into consideration all the points brought forward here today. I would not like to say whether they are practical or impractical. We will have to discuss it with our own people and make a decision accordingly.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. In setting a quota at the local country point, are you anxious to get the elevator houses filled, is that the idea, or, say just a certain number of carloads of grain in the elevator?—A. We are anxious to maximize the movement of grain. What we aim to do is to get your country elevators filled, and when you get the country elevators filled start beating the drums for the railways to furnish cars, and when you get those cars then you get the terminals filled. That is the process you have to go through in order to move any quantity of grain like has been moved this year, and I will say this, that when you take into account that as of the 5th day of June there were 601 million bushels of grain delivered by produces out of a total of 720 million bushels, that is a pretty good record.

Q. I think the delivery record is very good. Do you think the fact that there has been a transport controller has been of real assistance in getting the grain moved?—A. Yes, I think so.

Mr. FAIR: Have the transport controller and the board worked in perfect harmony all the time?

The WITNESS: I will say we have had our arguments, but if we had our arguments they have been in perfect harmony.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 9 carry?

Carried.

Shall we go on to No. 10?

Agreed.

Handling Agreements.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that in 1950-51 we entered into a handling agreement with the elevator companies on what we considered a fair margin for the handling of grain.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is this the point where we might discuss diversion charges?

The WITNESS: They come a little later. You know how the handling agreement is arrived at. We have a meeting with the elevator companies every year. We try to get the rates as low as possible and they, on the other hand, try to get the best rates they can, and we usually arrive at some sort of a compromise. At our meetings we meet not only with the private companies but also with the farmer-owned organizations.

Mr. FAIR: In the case of the pool elevator system it would not matter if they did soak you a little, because it will all be eventually distributed back to the farmer, but when you deliver grain to the private elevators it would go to the shareholders.

The WITNESS: You must have a uniform rate.

Mr. WARD: When did the 1/25 of a cent per month come into effect?

The WITNESS: That was in 1949-50 and it was reduced to 1/30 in 1951, and this year it is 1/35 cent.

Mr. HETLAND: 1/35 of a cent?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall No. 10 carry?

Carried.

No. 11. 1950-51 Pool Account—Wheat.

The WITNESS: That, Mr. Chairman, is self-explanatory. It just shows the boards receipts by months from producers, and then it goes on to show the grade pattern of the crop, which is an interesting figure. We only had 4.3 per cent of No. 1 Northern; 15.8 per cent of No. 2 Northern; 19.1 per cent of No. 3 Northern. We had 19.2 per cent of No. 5 wheat and 12.3 per cent of No. 6 wheat. We thought we had a bad tough and damp problem that year, but we did not have any idea what was going to come along in 1951-52.

The CHAIRMAN: Another paragraph of section 11, Sales Policy—Wheat.

The WITNESS: In view of the large carry-over in 1949-50, in view of the carry-over of the 31st July, 1950 and the large quantities of wheat delivered to the board, we adopted an aggressive sales policy throughout the year. I think that has been covered in an earlier section of the report, Mr. Chairman.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. How do your class 2 wheat prices compare to the American prices?—

A. That depends entirely upon conditions. This year we have operated fairly well under the American price because our crop was not of the highest quality. What it would be if we had a very high quality wheat crop, I do not know.

Q. How does the price of a given quality of our wheat compare to the price the Americans receive for the equivalent quality of their wheat?—A. It varies. At the present time I think their wheat is, as I recall several cents a bushel higher than ours.

Mr. BRYCE: What is the tariff on No. 1 Northern going into the States?

The WITNESS: It is now 21 cents.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: It is not the tariff, it is the quota. We can only ship in something like 500,000 bushels of the milling grades, in total.

Mr. BRYCE: But you have to pay so much a bushel to get it in?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: There is practically no shipment of milling grades to the United States. We are barred in effect from entering the United States; the only thing we can sell them is No. 6, hardly any No. 5 at all.

The WITNESS: The present tariff is 21 cents a bushel. There is a quota on milling wheat of 695,000 bushels and a tariff on the low grade wheat that will qualify at 5 per cent *ad valorem* duty.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Is the reason for selling our wheat of equivalent quality at a price somewhat less than the American price to get rid of the Class II wheat so we do not get too much on hand?—A. That is certainly the number one reason, yes.

Q. Would I be right in saying that the spread at the present time is 10 cents or a little more?—A. Not at the moment. I have not got the figures here.

Mr. RIDDEL: It depends on the grade, Mr. Chairman. I think there will be only 2 cents.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. Why is the quantity set at 695,000 bushels?—A. That is set by the American government.

Q. Why is it stipulated as such? Why isn't it 500,000 or 1 million?—A. That is a figure they selected when they decided to limit the importations of wheat into the United States. I do not know why they selected that particular figure.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Do you ever have negotiations with any of the American people as to the difference between our price and the American price?—A. Well, we find ourselves in this position, that we have quite a good surplus of wheat in this country and our American friends have quite a good surplus of wheat and they are just as anxious to find markets as we are. They strive to find markets and we do not try to work out any common price between ourselves and the United States.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. In your Class II sales on page 12 it classifies high grade wheat and low grade wheat. Is high grade wheat 1 to 4 and low grade 5?—A. 5 and lower, yes.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. There is quite a spread in price between high and low, isn't there?—A. But you have got to keep in mind both our Agreement and Class II prices. The Class II spread is wider.

Q. Well, the spread between Class II and the International Wheat Agreement spread is considerably greater than that, isn't it?—A. I think I can give you that. I have it here. The International Wheat Agreement price on the 13th of June was \$1.82½ cents for No. 1 Northern. The Class II price was \$2.20½ cents for No. 1 Northern.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. How does the 6 cents per bushel carrying charge which is added to the price of the International Wheat Agreement wheat, how does that 6 cents

carrying charge compare with the increased cost of handling wheat, say, between now and three years ago?—A. Well, we won't know until the end of this year but I think it is just about right as far as I know. It could be a bit high or a bit low. It has to be calculated ahead and part of it depends on the volume at which your grain moves.

Q. That is just really to compensate the Wheat Board fund for the increased cost of handling?—A. Well, under the International Wheat Agreement there is a provision in the agreement that carrying charges can be charged on an arrangement between buyer and seller. The sellers require a 6 cent carrying charge and, as you probably know, there was considerable discussion in the Council about it but the fact is that we are charging a 6 cent carrying charge for the handling of this present crop.

Q. Are other exporting countries doing the same?—A. They are doing the same, yes.

By Mr. Fair:

Q. With the depreciated American dollar today we are no longer receiving our \$1.80 or \$1.75 a bushel, are we?—A. Our actual net price aside from carrying charge—the figure I gave you included the carrying charge—was \$1.76 $\frac{1}{4}$ cents and to that you add the 6 cent carrying charge making \$1.82 $\frac{1}{4}$ cents which is your current comparison basis between that and Class II because you do not add carrying charges on your Class II prices.

Q. I see the American dollar depreciated a little more than 2 per cent the last day or two?—A. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: It seem to have been the general impression in the country that there was a considerable difference between the International Wheat Agreement sale price and Class II sales. According to figures here on the higher grade wheat there was only 11.5 cents difference in the price you obtained on the Class II sales as compared to the International Wheat Agreement sales?

Right Hon. Mr. Howe: What page are you looking at?

Mr. WRIGHT: Page 12 at the top of the page.

The CHAIRMAN: Sales prices.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

The WITNESS: If you take page 11 it gives you the prices by months.

Mr. WRIGHT: These figures are, I presume, correct here that on the total sales there was only '11 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents more obtained for Class II wheat than was obtained under the International Wheat Agreement?

Right Hon. Mr. Howe: This is at August 1950 and the American prices at that time were not far out of line with the International Wheat Agreement prices.

The WITNESS: Well, the figures are there, Mr. Wright. The International Wheat Agreement sales realized price was \$1.89 cents and the domestic sales \$1.90 cents with a fraction (I am not reading the fractions) Class II sales \$2.05 cents for high grade wheat and \$1.90 cents for low grade wheat.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. That is 15 cents?—A. 16 cents.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Of course you did not add that 6 cent carrying charge to the Class II wheat though, did you?—A. No.

Right Hon. Mr. Howe: The only time the 6 per cent carrying charge applies is when they are selling under agreement for maximum prices. If it slips off the maximum the 6 cent figure means nothing.

The CHAIRMAN: Are we through with section 11?

Agreed.

By Mr. Catherwood:

Q. An item rather intrigued me here. It says: "The Board sold wheat on a scale which pressed on available transportation through the crop year." Could the board have sold more wheat had more transportation been available?—A. Well, I do not know that I can give you an unqualified answer to that question. I will say this: that with regard to the low grade wheat, I think we placed every bushel of wheat that could possibly be placed in any country that was interested in the purchase of low grade wheat.

With regard to the high grade wheat, it was limited in volume throughout the year. We had a good demand for it throughout the year and when we came to the end of July, however, we had additional deliveries that were made in July that could not have been put out in 1950-51. They were made to the country elevators so that it is a difficult question to make an unqualified answer.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. There was considerable discussion at least in the country that we had lost considerable sales of low grade wheat to the United States due to transportation difficulties when we were not able to deliver when they needed it. To what extent is that true?—A. I would say that on the whole we got in a very big volume of low grade wheat into the United States. I frankly do not know whether we could have got any more or not at certain times. I would like to explain that with regard to the sale of low grade wheat unless you consider the producer expendable you just cannot go out and sell it the same as you do other wheat. You have got to wait your turn and wait your market and that is what we have done and that is the policy we have followed. When you ask a question as to whether more low grade wheat could be sold or not we cannot discuss that question without discussing the price.

Q. I was not referring to the price and I want to say that I think the Board's policy is a very wise one with regard to not trying to push something that there was not a market for but the understanding was, at least in some parts of the country, that we could have been selling more low grade wheat to the United States at the prices which we were getting for it had we been able to deliver it promptly.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is my recollection too. I think if we could have delivered wheat during the winter of 1950 we could have sold more.

The WITNESS: Yes, perhaps so during the winter.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: We get these years confused but that is as I remember it.

Mr. FERRIE: Mr. Chairman, I think that we do a lot of criticizing but I think if you look at high grade and low grade wheat, I think there has been a great service rendered there and I think something should be said to congratulate the board for making such a close estimate as this and selling it so close. There is high grade and low grade wheat there and they are very very close together, the prices they got for both of them. There must have been a real job done there by somebody.

Mr. WRIGHT: I agree with that.

Mr. ROSS: On that point, at the top of page 12 the board sold to the 1951-52 pool high grade wheat at \$1.86 and there is low grade wheat at \$1.90.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I was looking at that. I wonder if that is a misprint.

Mr. ROSS: What is the answer?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The top of page 12?

The WITNESS: We will just take a look at it, Mr. Howe.

Mr. HETLAND: It says at the bottom:

Exclusive of 6-cent per bushel carrying charge which became effective on June 15, 1951.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: It says:

Actual realized prices for straight grades of No. 5, No. 6 and Feed wheat were \$1.70142, \$1.61097 and \$1.53905 per bushel respectively. I guess that is the sales basis for No. 1 Northern wheat there?

The WITNESS: Yes, I think it is. Perhaps if we can go on I will get that figure checked, Mr. Howe.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Is that the question I was asking about the difference between the low and high grade?—A. Yes.

Q. That is your own transaction to the pool at the end of the year?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. On what basis did you arrive at the transfer price?—A. We have the transfer covered in the report a little later on. I am sorry, page 9, that is one thing we skipped. I am going to ask Mr. Riddel is he will explain that; he is our expert on those prices.

Mr. RIDDEL: Mr. Chairman, the prices on page 12, the question I think was why the sale of the No. 1 low grade wheat the sale to the 1951-52 pool was a higher price compared to the high grade.

If you will turn back to page 9 you will see the actual price for the high grade wheat at the top righthand corner of the page. You will find the transfer price for No. 1 Northern was \$1.94 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents and we take from that price 2 cents per bushel to cover carrying charges during the period that wheat would be under sale.

Then, when you go back to page 11, we have deducted from the \$1.92 the 6 cents per bushel carrying charge which was credited to the carrying charge expense account.

Now, on the low grade wheat, you will find that the No. 5 wheat was transferred at \$1.86 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents per bushel. The price given on page 12 for low grade wheat is under the heading: "Sales Basis, Basis No. 1 Nor. Wheat". If you add to the \$1.86 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents shown for the high grade wheat the 6 cent carrying charge you would get a price of \$1.92 cents compared to the \$1.90 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents. That 2 cent difference represents the additional 2 cents which was taken off for carrying charges on the low grade wheat because we figured it would have to be carried for a longer period compared to the high grade wheat. But the important thing is that these prices are shown basis No. 1 Northern, not basis high grade and basis low grade.

By Mr. Major:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I am looking at these high grade and low grade wheat and I notice the prices are very, very close. Do these prices include this wheat we get down in the east, this wheat our chickens won't eat?—A. I have not heard of that.

Q. I know I have bought some and the chickens refuse to eat it.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I was coming down on the train and I met a man. He did not know who I was and I did not know who he was. He was telling me about the wheat pool. He said: "They are wonderful people. I grew some wheat and my hens would not eat it and the wheat pool paid me \$1.40 for it."

The WITNESS: The wheat that is finding a home in eastern Canada now is tough No. 5 wheat and it might be the chickens down here won't eat it but there are a good many people in Europe who are putting it in their mill grist.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Two years ago there were some very low grades of feed wheat in the west where frost is severe and I was wondering if the board's policy was to improve the grades of feed wheat by mixing the various grades that there are in feed wheat before selling because I have seen some wheat that was being delivered as feed wheat at 35 or 36 pounds to the bushel and other feed wheat being delivered that weighed 57 pounds or 58 pounds to the bushel. Well, if farmers in the east would happen to get the 35 pound to the bushel wheat I do not suppose the chickens would eat it and if it was mixed they would get a better grade. Is there any possibility of having two grades of feed wheat which would distinguish between the actual value that there is in feed wheat?—A. I think by the time it comes out of their terminal elevators that the inequality between the 35 and 50 cent pounds has disappeared.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The private elevator can mix anything in the feed grades, 5 and 6, and do. They turn out a minimum 5 and a pretty fair feed.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. What is the policy of the board in sales of feed or lower grades in Canada? Is it to get as much as the traffic will bear at all times?—A. Well, we sell the feed grades and charge in Canada the same price that we sell them overseas at, and we find that in years when we have a big surplus of feed wheat we get the best price we can, the best price the market will pay. In years in which there is a smaller percentage of feed wheat there is a good feed demand, both by Canada and the United States.

Q. The feed price is dictated by the export market? I bring that up because I think it is the thing Mr. Major is indicating. We in British Columbia use a lot of low grade grains, and most of the farmers out there say it is very difficult at present prices to transfer grains into livestock or livestock products at present prices of feed. The consequence is that between the cost of the grain and the transferring of it to the livestock prices there is not much advantage. I think that is general.—A. I think probably the problem is the livestock, because there has been very little variation in low grade prices in the last five or six months; there may have been some but it is just a matter of cents.

Q. Livestock in Canada are competing with human bellies elsewhere, that's what it amounts to?—A. I suppose, yes.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Would it assist any in the sale of feed wheat if there were two grades in it, or would it hinder the sale?—A. Mr. Wright, we have so many grades of wheat now that sometimes we wonder that we can keep our reason, and I think if we had two more—

Q. That would only add one more to some 300 that you have now.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on section 11?

Mr. DINSDALE: As regards the sale of wheat to the United States, I notice you sell quite a quantity and yet at one point in the discussion you said the Americans had a surplus. Why are we successful in selling that quantity, then?

The WITNESS: When I said they have a surplus, they have a surplus of milling grades of wheat, but there was a quota, which was mentioned earlier, into the United States of 695,000 bushels of milling grades, but in so far as

the feed grades are concerned those grades go in under a 5 per cent ad valorem duty basis, and are used for feed in a similar manner to which their corn is used. A lot of it goes to the New England states and is put in their feed mixtures down there.

Mr. WRIGHT: In regard to the sale of oats—

The CHAIRMAN: We will come to oats in a minute. That will be No. 12.

Are we through with section No. 11?

Carried.

Section No. 12, Oats and Barley, Crops and Supplies.

Just a moment. We were discussing a while ago the time we would adjourn. I want to suggest that we adjourn at 10.30. Some said we should adjourn at ten and I said eleven, but I think now we shall adjourn at 10.30.

Agreed.

Mr. ARGUE: Why not adjourn right now when we are starting oats?

The WITNESS: Before we get to oats, I am certain Mr. Wright will bring this up and we ought to get at it tonight. It is the question of diversion charges.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is included in here?

The WITNESS: On page 10.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. My understanding was that when these diversion charges were allowed in the first place it was because of the custom which we had in the west of special binning of grain. The farmer could secure a special bin and hold that bin until he had filled it and then he could make delivery of his wheat, if it was still in his possession, to any terminal. Now the elevator companies had a charge for special binning that they did not think was sufficient to cover all of the costs and it was natural when the grain which was in the special bin was delivered to their terminal that they were able to earn enough on it to pay the total cost of handling charges. That was my understanding of the original institution of the diversion charges, so you could give the elevator company a further earning on certain grains on which they figured that the charges they were making in the country elevator were not sufficient to cover, but during the last, oh I should say five years there have been very few elevator companies who would allow a farmer to secure a special bin, because it does tie up their working space in an elevator, and with the number of grades we have had to handle recently— —A. Well, now, with regard to diversion charges, the most wheat that is diverted in western Canada away from the terminals goes to the mills and, as I mentioned earlier, we signed a handling agreement with the companies every year, and part of that agreement relates to the question of diversion charges. In regard to the wheat that goes to the mills, the mills pay those diversion charges themselves, they pay those to the elevator companies, so the farmer does not gain or lose in regard to milled wheat. That comprises the biggest proportion of wheat that is diverted in western Canada. Then you come into points like Moose Jaw and Saskatchewan, Churchill, in which there has been great controversy about diversion charges, and there they are also a part of the handling agreement, and the elevator companies generally, including the farmers' companies, take the stand that if they handle wheat through their country facilities they are entitled to the terminal handling, and if the wheat is diverted away from this terminal they are entitled to a diversion charge, and our effort is to try to reduce this charge as much as possible, or if possible we would like to have it done away with, but the reply of the elevator companies is that if you take

away the diversion charge you must give them an earning some place else, and that is the situation the board is confronted with.

Now, we have put it up to the elevator companies in regard to Churchill. We said to them why not ship to Churchill without a diversion charge, but we obtained a blank refusal, and in order to come to an agreement we have agreed to these diversion charges. We have tried to have them as low as possible, but that is the basis of their argument. One thing we should keep in mind always is the large quantity of grain that is diverted, the diversion charge is paid by the mills.

Q. I would think it would be much fairer to allow the handling companies a charge that is sufficient at their country elevators rather than discriminate against certain parts by having a diversion charge there which is not—
—A. There is no discrimination against—

Q. There is discrimination in the fact that none of the elevator companies have actual facilities at Churchill. They have, I think, facilities at Port Arthur and Vancouver, where there are very little diversion charges against grain going to Port Arthur and Vancouver, that is in comparison to the charge on grain going to Churchill.—A. There they have their own facilities.

Q. That is the point.—A. But in so far as Churchill is concerned, I can say the diversion charge has not affected the movement at all. That has not been the limiting factor at all in regard to the Churchill movement.

Q. I know, but it is a charge against all grain going to that port. It is not applicable to most of the grain going to Port Arthur and Fort William or Vancouver.—A. I would just suggest that we have a total charge in this account of \$578,000, which is not purely diversion charges. Division charges are only a portion of that, but I am sure if we tried to work out another agreement that would provide for a change, that the producers as a whole would lose.

Mr. FAIR: What is the average diversion charge?

The WITNESS: Well, to Churchill I think it is about 1½ cents.

By Mr. Ferrie:

Q. Would not the producer gain if the board took over and leased all the terminals and handled them all themselves?—A. We certainly would lose if we leased the Churchill terminal, there is no question about that.

Q. But of course that is a government terminal?—A. It would then become the property of the producer. We would much prefer to have the government operate the Churchill terminal.

Q. You cannot get that one anyway because the line belongs to the government too.—A. I would not like to try to persuade them too much to turn it over to us.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I have offered to turn it over to anybody who showed the least interest in it.

Mr. FERRIE: Would those at Port Arthur and Fort William offset the one at Churchill if they were leased? There seems to be an awful lot of money in that. There would not be any transfer or anything else.

The WITNESS: Our general position is we obtain the service from these various companies, including the farm organizations, pools and the United Grain Growers, and our position is that we do not believe that this service is out of line. I think our handling contracts have been fair if these companies are going to be able to maintain their facilities in the proper order and proper condition.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. You said it was 1½ cents at Churchill, the diversion charge. Does it vary at Port Arthur and Vancouver?—A. Yes, it varies, Mr. Bryce.

Q. In any case is it more than that?—A. I think my recollection is that Prince Rupert is $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents. I will get those figures from Mr. Riddel. There is no diversion charge at either Vancouver or the lakehead because the elevator companies have their own terminals. Here are the diversion charges:

On wheat shipped or diverted to interior mills, two cents (2c.) per bushel on grades Number One Hard, Numbers One, Two, Three and Four Northern and Four Special, Numbers One, Two and Three C. W. Garnet, Number One Alberta Red Winter, Numbers Two and Three Alberta Winter, Numbers One, Two and Three C. W. Amber Durum, Numbers One, Two and Three C. W. White Spring, including the Rejected Sprouted of these grades, and two and one-half cents ($2\frac{1}{2}$ c.) per bushel on all other grades; with an additional one cent (1c.) per bushel on wheat grading Tough Number Four Northern and Tough Number Four Special, and one-half cent ($\frac{1}{2}$ c.) per bushel on all other grades of Tough wheat in accordance with arrangements between the companies and the mills.

Now, the board has nothing to do with that. The companies get together with the mills and that is the arrangement they make.

On all wheat shipped or diverted to Churchill and Prince Rupert one and one-half cents ($1\frac{1}{2}$ c.) per bushel.

On wheat shipped or diverted to interior government terminal elevators two cents (2c.) per bushel on all tough and damp grades; two cents (2c.) per bushel on all wheat carrying sufficient dockage to incur cleaning charges; two cents (2c.) per bushel on all wheat that is not later forwarded to terminal elevators at Fort William, Port Arthur, Vancouver or New Westminster, provided that a premium has not already been paid as herein set forth. (It is understood that the premiums to be paid in respect of Clause (a) (iii) shall not exceed two cents (2c.) per bushel on any or all wheat so ordered, shipped or diverted to these interior terminals.)

The rest of this has to do with oats and barley.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Perhaps I could explain the basis for that arrangement. For example, some merchant might start with one country elevator and later add other country elevators, and finally he has, say, 100 country elevators. He feels that with 100 country elevators he can feed a 2 million bushel terminal, so he goes to the head of the lakes and builds a terminal costing \$2 million or \$3 million, secure in the fact that through his country elevators he has business for that terminal. Now, if the Wheat Board comes along and diverts all the grain from those 100 country elevators while he has a terminal at Port Arthur, then his terminal elevator becomes a bill of expense instead of a source of revenue. That is the basis for it. The dealer believes he should be secure in handling the grain that is put through his country elevators and if he is not, he wants compensation. I think that is fair enough.

MR. ARGUE: It is 10:30.

The CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn till 11:30 tomorrow morning.

The committee adjourned.

EVIDENCE

JUNE 17th, 1952.
11:30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Last night we had practically completed section 11 on page 12, and I think this morning we are in order to consider section 12, oats and barley.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that pages 9 and 10 were missing in the book that I had yesterday and there are some questions I would like to ask on page 10. I did not think we had completed our discussion of diversion charges, this page 10 contains the complete wheat account and I would like with your permission to ask some further questions on that.

The CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

Mr. George H. McIvor, Chief Commissioner, The Canadian Wheat Board, called:

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Could we have a breakdown of (d) of 6, handling, stop-off and diversion charges, to get what those constitute.—A. I have that right here, Mr. Wright. The total diversion charges under that heading was \$299,055.63.

Q. Have you a breakdown of that as to the different diversion charges as against the port of Churchill, the port of Prince Rupert, and as distinguished from the mill diversion charges?—A. We can get that for you. It would just take a minute or two. If you would like to go on to something else?

Q. Yes. Could we have a breakdown of (c), additional freight (net), \$35,972.39? I take it that that is all the collections made by the board as a result of the cheaper freight rate to Churchill as opposed to any charges which they may have had to charge on grain from Alberta going to Port Arthur and Fort William.—A. I will have to get the information for that item too, Mr. Wright.

Q. Yes. And could we have an explanation of (e), drying, reconditioning, grade adjustments, et cetera, carried on by the board? Just what drying and reconditioning is done by the board itself as against the drying and reconditioning that has been done by the elevator companies? I take it that most of the drying and reconditioning has been done by the elevator companies before turning the grain over to the board?—A. No, not necessarily. We take delivery of the grain at the terminal and then the terminal dries it for our account.

Q. Well, have you any breakdown as to what drying is done by the companies themselves as against the amount that you people recondition yourselves?—A. We would not have any knowledge of what drying the company did on their own grain, but in so far as the Wheat Board are concerned the drying is done by the terminal on behalf of the board.

Mr. ARGUE: When the terminal elevators have your tough or damp grain do you pay them for putting that in condition, or do you buy it on the tough and damp basis and pay them for drying?

The WITNESS: We take it over from the company which shipped the grain in the first place at the tough or damp price. The terminal dries for our account. We have to pay the drying charges. But remember, in the first instance, it is taken over at the tough or damp spread that exists and the drying charges are an off-set against that spread. On this particular item I will have to get a breakdown for you, Mr. Argue.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Also, with respect (a) carrying charges including terminal storage, could we have a breakdown of that as to the different amounts involved in that \$22,447,953.72? I take it that that figure is a 4½-cent carrying charge made by the elevator companies for wheat and barley and the 3·5 cent carrying charge on oats.—A. I think, Mr. Wright, if I may say so that you are confusing the handling charge in the country with the carrying charge.

Q. That is what I wanted to get clear.—A. Yes. The actual carrying charge is fixed in our agreement with the handling companies on a certain storage base plus interest. The margin of handling in the country is 4·5 cents and 3·5 cents has nothing to do with the carrying charge.

Q. And that has nothing to do with this?—A. No.

Q. That is the point I wanted to get clear. Now, in the carrying charges there will be interest involved?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that in the \$22,447,000, or is that included in (b) interest and bank charges, \$1,710,381.66?—A. Well, both are partly right. In regard to the carrying charges, we pay the carrying charges on grain that is carried by us by the country elevator system until it is delivered to the terminal elevators. That item includes interest and the cost of insurance. When the wheat is delivered to the terminals we take over the warehouse receipts and then the carrying charge becomes the storage charge, but if we have to borrow money against the wheat at that time we have to pay interest.

Q. Well then, could we have a breakdown of that \$22,477,000 as to the amount of carrying charges paid to the handling companies as opposed to the amounts paid to the terminal elevator companies?—A. Yes.

Mr. WYLIE: Mr. Chairman, we cannot hear anything down here.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you speak a little louder, Mr Wright?

By Mr. Wright:

Q. And also the amount included in interest in that amount, interest paid to the companies by you to take care of their borrowings from the bank while they have the grain in their possession, and interest paid by you people to the banks while you have the grain in your possession?

Mr. WOOD: To what item are you referring?

Q. To the first item in section 6, operating costs, to item (a) carrying charges including terminal storage, the \$22,447,000. My understanding is that when you people borrow to carry grain you get your loans from the banks at 3 per cent.—A. 3¼ now.

Q. 3¼?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, the companies when they are borrowing carry the same grain with the same security because the grain is the security, pay 4 per cent or better for their loans?—A. It depends on the position of the grain. If it is in country elevators they pay 4 per cent and if it is in the terminal elevator they pay 3½ per cent.

Q. That is what the companies pay to the banks?—A. Yes.

Q. Just why would there be—I do not know whether or not you can answer this question—but why should the bank charge 3¼ per cent when it is in the terminal elevator while they charge 4 per cent interest on the same grain, on the same security, when it is in the country elevator?—A. well, I should not attempt to answer for the banks, but my feeling would be that when they loan money against grain in the terminal elevators they have as collateral negotiable warehouse receipts, and when they put up their own money against grain in the country—I think it is under section 88 of the Bank Act—they only have as guarantee a statement from the company as to the amount of grain that there is on hand, and I consider they probably regard it as being a greater risk.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. Just one question on this section (b), interest and bank charges, is any of that \$1,710,000 recovered; or is that the net interest paid?—A. Well, we were discussing last night a carrying charge which we recovered on the sale of our grain, which is 6 cents a bushel. Now, that is offset against all the carrying charges we must pay whether it is bank interest or whether it is carrying charges against grain in the country or in the terminals.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. There is one other question with regard to 4, recovery of storage, interest and differential charges. Could we have a breakdown on that as to just what that recovery is? And, could you give us an explanation of the item?—A. Yes, we will do that, Mr. Wright.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hetland:

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Mr. Chairman, when the elevator company buys damp or tough wheat do they have to deliver damp or tough wheat on that ticket?—A. Yes, they do.

Q. They do?—A. Yes.

Q. You mean, now, for instance, if they should deliver dry to you—
—A. They are getting paid for damp III.

Q. By you?—A. Yes.

Q. You know how the situation was last fall, the buyer buys tough III, and this spring this grain turns out dry III and it was shipped out as dry. Who would get the gain?—A. They must deliver to us what they buy. We only pay them for the grade that they deliver to us. Now, if they blend it out in the country, they get the gain.

Q. They get the gain?—A. Yes.

Q. But if they buy damp 3 wheat they necessarily do not have to give you this damp 3 wheat?—A. It would be physically impossible for them to deliver every grade they take in.

Q. What I am getting at is if there is a break in the market or the weather would they get the gain from tough to dry 2?—A. They get the advantage if there is any mixing in the country elevators and they have to accept the loss for any loss of grades.

Q. That is what I am trying to get at, they don't have to deliver the grade that you buy?—A. No.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. What does the Wheat Board do with surplus funds which it has on hand?—A. We do our very best to seek out the people the funds belong to, and we have been very successful in keeping those sums down to quite a small percentage of the amount of payment in the first instance.

Q. That is not what I had in mind. What do you do if you have surplus money on hand, I mean, from your operations? Do you invest it in Treasury bills?—A. We have bought Treasury bills at times and we have left the money on deposit in the banks. I think, if I may suggest this, Mr. Chairman, you are getting into the comptroller's field here and he will appear later before the committee and I would prefer that he would answer these questions.

Q. Then the question of 1(b) "wheat otherwise acquired" that is the overage, I believe. On what basis do you pay for the overage?—A. We pay the initial payment price.

Q. No matter what time the overages are acquired?—A. That is right.

Q. And no further price?—A. No.

By Mr. Fair:

Q. Dealing, Mr. Chairman, with grain that is taken into the elevators this spring for handling down as low as 11, have the grain companies mixed that with last fall's tough grain, brought it up to 14 or 14.3 or 14.4 and received benefit by that mixing?—A. I presume they have done some of that, Mr. Fair. We won't know until the end of the year just what the companies have been able to do in regard to grade losses or gains. They claim that in the early part of the year they had substantial grade losses but we won't know until the final accounting of this year as to where we stand on that.

Q. There is the possibility though, that the grain companies do mix dry grain and tough grain?—A. Yes, and it is a very useful service this year, I can assure you.

Q. Yes, I can realize that—very beneficial to certain companies?—A. Very beneficial to all of us.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. If I may go into that a little further I do not know what the conditions were during 1950-51 which we are discussing in regard to that. I suppose your breakdown of the reconditioned, drying and grain adjustments will show what you possibly did with regard to that. I think, as you said, there is a definite place for mixing especially in crops such as we have had in the last two years. I know last fall a great deal of the grain in our part of the country was grading No. 4 tough or damp with a content moisture in the top cases of approximately 15 per cent. This spring some grain was grading 5 dry with a little over 11 per cent moisture. I am sure that if we had the facilities on the farm to take up our tough grain that we had last fall and the dry grain this spring and mix them we would have got a 4 straight, and got a better price as a result of it.

Now, somewhere in the process of that grain going through the country elevators and the terminals it seems to me there is a legitimate point somewhere where that mixing could take place. What I am interested in is where it does take place. Does it take place at a point where the producer gets the benefit of it or does it take place at a point where the handling company may get the benefit of it? To what extent do your board as a board make gains out of mixing such as that?—A. Well, we gain to this extent, that all of the drying facilities in Canada were taxed to the utmost to take care of the tough and damp grain. If it had not been possible to take care of it it would have been lost and due to the splendid weather we had this spring grain that otherwise might have been completely destroyed was recoverable and marketable.

Now, from our standpoint, in order to sell grain abroad we want it in its dry state and we certainly were very pleased to see the efforts that were made by the companies to put the grain in a merchantable condition.

Q. Do you as a board endeavour to put it in a merchantable condition after you receive it if it is not already in that condition?—A. Then we have to turn it into the driers.

Q. You can dry by mixing?—A. That is right.

Q. To what extent are you people yourselves as a board engaged in that operation?—A. We do not do any mixing ourselves but if it is possible for the company to do what is called natural drying instead of artificial drying, we encourage it.

Q. But you do not as a board do any of it yourselves after you take over physical possession at the head of the lakes?—A. No, we do not.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. And for natural drying the handling companies make that gain, whatever it is?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Well, just why would you not do that as a board yourselves, take it over and do the mixing yourselves at the head of the lakes, at the terminals. There are elevators. Why leave it as an operation for the handling companies?—A. Well, we do not have any terminals to start with; we do not own any terminals. Now, to have to hire a lot of special bins under the conditions which apply today with elevators badly congested would be a physical impossibility and we think from our standpoint it is a very satisfactory operation. I think we all should be most gratified that under the conditions which applied this year the companies were able to salvage grain that otherwise would have been a complete loss to this country.

Q. I would agree with you in that, that it does not matter where grain is salvaged as long as it is salvaged and put in condition for export but I still think that it should be salvaged in such a way that the producer gets the benefit rather than the handling company. Whether that could be done by you people as a board or not you would know better than I.—A. I would say that when we got all through with it we would be no farther ahead than we are now, Mr. Wright, except to have a lot of additional headaches which we do not have at the present time.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I bought grain for a while and if I could buy wheat that was 15·15 and I could get grain that was 13·5, I would go straight for all of it. From what I know of all the elevators concerned they are going to give the break to the sellers in that case. If a local elevator man can mix grain and give the producer the benefit he usually always does it because competition is so keen but as far as mixing is concerned every man in the local elevators mixes usually to the producer's benefit, not to his own or to the elevator's.

This year we had a certain condition there where we had so much dry wheat that any farmer who had a tough bin of wheat in my district which was 15·5 and had enough dry grade 5 or 4 he got straight for all of it so the producer got the benefit of it there. But what was sold last fall the elevator company gets the benefit there and if he has it in his house the producer in the spring even gets the benefit.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, the seller in the spring, it would be impossible for him to get the benefit of it because he only delivered dry grain in the spring and he had already delivered his tough grain last fall.

MR. HETLAND: Not all. I think there was a lot of tough and damp grain left in our district.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Did I understand Mr. McIvor to say that a certain amount of tough and damp grain came into possession of the Wheat Board this spring or was that only last fall or during the winter?—A. No, we have been taking delivery of tough and damp grain all year.

Q. Well, once the dry grain starts to come into your possession, then when you load out wouldn't it be possible to mix a certain percentage of damp or tough grain with the dry to the percentage necessary to make it safe in unloading?—A. That has been done and I would just like to repeat again that in order to salvage this past crop everything had to be done in addition to the use of the drying facilities. The drying facilities were used to their capacity. The wheat was blended where it was possible to do so. We made arrangements with overseas countries to take millions of bushels of tough wheat and it was only by doing that that it was possible to salvage this crop and I can tell you frankly it was tough and go as to whether the crop was saved or not.

Q. Does the operation of drying result in a higher profit than the loss in weight—is the cost of drying always offset by the increased price for the grain that is dried?—A. Well, we try as far as possible. To fix our spread at the start of the grain year to take into account what it would cost to dry the grain and the shrinkage.

Now, it is not possible to do it exactly because we do not know how much moisture is going to be in the grain and this year the grain has been on the heavy side as far as moisture is concerned.

Now, your question that we can sell out the tough wheat at a spread that is more satisfactory than the full cost of drying, the producer gets the benefit because that is the actual sales price.

Q. You would imagine that due to the fact that the grain which was harvested this spring was very very dry, it was 11 in many cases, then the company that got that grain and held it in their possession could have made some profit by mixing with last fall's wheat?—A. Well, picturing the position in the country I would say that the producer gets the benefit. After all a big percentage of your grain is handled by your own co-operative companies.

Q. Yes.—A. And whatever they do the others seem to follow suit or vice versa.

Right Hon. Mr. Howe: Perhaps I might point out, if Mr. McIvor agrees, that we are really discussing a matter that is within the jurisdiction of the Board of Grain Commissioners. They are in charge of drying grain. I think perhaps if we can take this up with them we can deal with it better.

By Right Hon. Mr. Howe:

Q. You do not really control the drying of grain? You put it in the elevators and it goes out of your control as far as the drying is concerned?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Well, I understand, Mr. McIvor, in answering my questions that the board did not do any mixing and then in answer to Mr. Quelch I understood you to say that in some cases when you were loading out that you did mix?—A. No, I said the elevator companies mixed. That is what I intended to say anyway.

Q. With regard to the answering of Mr. Quelch's questions?—A. Yes, and yours as well.

Q. I misunderstood you.

Right Hon. Mr. Howe: The grain when it goes into the man's elevator comes under the supervision of the Board of Grain Commissioners and the drying is done by their regulations. I think perhaps that Board could explain this in greater detail.

MR. WRIGHT: The only point I was interested in was to what extent the board itself mixed grain to get the best grade possible out of it and to satisfy the buyers as to delivery of the best quality that they could of the different grains.

Right Hon. Mr. Howe: The answer is that the board do not mix at all.

By Mr. Major:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in mixing from possibly another angle. Last night I understood at page 12 where it shows high and low grade wheat with a low grade price of \$1.90 and \$1.86 cents if the carrying charge was not added—\$1.86 for the year 1951-52. When that is mixed do you include a very low grade wheat with another grade of wheat?—A. We do not mix at all to start with.

Q. But somebody does.—A. The elevator companies do mix but I think, if I may say so, that when it gets down to the basis of quality, that is definitely a question for the Board of Grain Commissioners because in their mixing operations when a grain is shipped out it has to comply with the terms and conditions of the Canada Grain Act.

Q. What I would like to point out here is that that grain is being mixed with a very low grade which is not good enough for feeding purposes. And when it is mixed with the better quality from that I would come to this conclusion in the country where we use your wheat for feeding purposes to sell a finished product either dairy, or cows or poultry, for instance, at this present time of the year for a few months when our prices have been down the feed has been held at the same level as it was previous and it is getting to be very difficult for the producers of this section of the country to be able to buy that wheat and feed it and be able to carry on and make a living out of it.

Now, from my notes here when you have your high grade wheat, you say, at \$1.86 and your low grade wheat at \$1.90 it would lead me to believe that you would have a kind of two price system—one for the exports and that you have another for your distributor's price of low grade which we pay here—is that correct?—A. No, that is not correct. As a matter of fact, this whole point was explained last night to the committee. I do not know whether or not you were in the room. Those prices are on a basis of No. 1 Northern, as you will note at the top of that column.

But with regard to your point about prices being too high for eastern Canada, I do not think we could be expected to sell to eastern Canada at a price lower than we can get in the United States and overseas, and that is the price we are getting.

Q. And that is the basis of your price all the way through?—A. Yes.

Q. Although your domestic price would be higher for your lower grade than your export price?—A. No. Our domestic price for our low grade, and our export price for our low grade are exactly the same.

By Mr. Fair:

Q. In connection with the benefits gained by the mixing of dry and tough grain, I understood Mr. McIvor to state that when the pools, who only handle a percentage of the grain of the country, go ahead with it, then the companies will follow. I think I stated last night that any gains which were made by the pools as a result of mixing go back again to the producers; but in the case of gains made by the grain companies, they would go to the shareholders rather than to the fellow who produced the grain. Would that be correct?—A. The only difference in that is, if you will recall it, that I said "vice versa" in reference to conditions in the country. If the private companies did various things, then the pools would follow suit, or vice versa, except that the patronage dividends that were paid by many of the companies outside the pool plan would go to the shareholders.

Q. Some of the companies did pay a small patronage dividend in recent years?—A. A great number of them do, yes.

Mr. FERRIE: Do you sell class 2 wheat, tough?

The WITNESS: Yes, we do.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Can you give us any idea of the quantity of wheat in this crop year which was naturally dry?—A. We are only partially through this crop year.

Q. I mean 1950-51.—A. I do not know.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The Board of Grain Commissioners would have that information. Mr. McIvor would not have it.

Mr. WRIGHT: At the top of page 11 it says:

Administrative and general expenses amounted to \$1,406,169.06, or 3834 cents per bushel on deliveries of 366,723,229.55 bushels.

How does this compare with your former statements?

The WITNESS: Would you mind asking Mr. Earl that question?

Mr. WRIGHT: Very well.

Mr. QUELCH: How dry do you consider it necessary to get wheat before you ship it? You stated that you had sold some tough wheat. How much moisture must there be?

The WITNESS: We figure about 15½ per cent.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on section 11?

Mr. CARDIFF: I would like to know what has been paid over the price that has been paid for feed grain and feed wheat to the farmer in the west?

The WITNESS: That is at the bottom of page 12; those are the actual realized prices, at the bottom of page 12; and if you want to know what was paid to the farmer, it is all here; and if you refer to page 9, you will see that all the grades are there at the bottom of the page.

Mr. HETLAND: This is f.o.b. Fort William?

The WITNESS: This is "in store", Fort William.

Mr. HETLAND: The farmer has to pay the handling and the freight charges as well.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The farmer pays the freight charges, you say? No, the government pays the freight charges east of Fort William.

Mr. ARGUE: Well somebody has to get it to Fort William anyway.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: We pay it east of Fort William.

Mr. ROSS: The government does not pay anything to Fort William.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: No; these are prices in store Fort William, and the freight to Fort William has to be deducted to arrive at the price at the country elevator.

Mr. HETLAND: And the handling charges?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question, Mr. Hetland?

Mr. HETLAND: Yes.

Mr. CARDIFF: If we are the best buyers of western grain, and I think we are the best market they have in the west for feed grain, then I cannot understand why we should have to pay so much for it in the east more than what the farmer gets for it in the west. Where does all this money go in between?

Mr. FAIR: You will have to see about the freight rates.

Mr. CARDIFF: It is not the freight; I do not mind the western farmer getting a good price for his grain, but I object to somebody in between getting what we should have.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Could you give us, for the 1950-51 crop year the amount of low grade wheat sold in Canada as compared with the amount that was exported?—A. We will have to get that for you.

Q. I think that would partially answer the question; I think most of the feed grain was export.—A. You mean the low grade wheat?

Q. Yes.—A. The amount used in Canada was very small compared with the amount exported.

Q. That is what I thought.

Mr. HETLAND: Would Mr. McIvor please repeat his answer?

The WITNESS: I was asked to state the amount of low grade wheat used in Canada. It was very small as compared with the amount exported, I mean, that was exported and is being exported.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: As to the pricing policy on wheat sold in Canada, that is, feed wheat and coarse grain, we got our instructions from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and it was agreed by the Federation that the board would sell at the best price obtainable in any market, and that all prices would be the same. Those were instructions we received from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture; and it was only after getting those instructions that we undertook to market oats and barley.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cardiff has the floor.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That applied to feed wheat and coarse grain.

By Mr. Major:

Q. I notice that on page 9 you state that your feed wheat was realized at \$1.54 $\frac{3}{4}$; that comes out at \$2.40 per hundred pounds. We buy at the rate of 100 pounds here. I buy my feed wheat from \$3.25 up. The last price I paid was \$3.25 but it is a very low price you pay here, when it is \$2.40 with 85 cents per 100 pounds of spread between the price which the western farmer gets and the price I pay for it.—A. The grade you are getting now is tough No. 5; that is the grade being sold in eastern Canada.

Q. There is a 6 cent difference there?

The CHAIRMAN: Are you sure, Mr. Major?

By Mr. Major:

Q. I would like to know where that difference is. This difference, I can see, is 85 cents; where is it, in between what the farmer gets and what we have to pay for it?—A. You are talking presumably about whole wheat now, or crushed?

Q. Whole wheat.—A. Yes; but the grade we are selling in eastern Canada now is tough No. 5.

Q. Presently?—A. Yes, and we have been doing that for some time.

Mr. WRIGHT: What is the price you are selling it at?

The WITNESS: At the going price. I have not the price here in front of me, but it is what the going market price in eastern Canada pays.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: What is the price today? We will check this down?

The WITNESS: Tough No. 5 wheat is quoted—the last price we have—at \$1.64 $\frac{3}{8}$ in Fort William, and it includes the carrying charges.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions, Mr. Major?

Mr. MAJOR: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Gour.

Mr. GOUR: I am a seller of wheat, barley, and oats.

The CHAIRMAN: You mean that you are a dealer.

Mr. GOUR: A dealer, yes; and the difference between the west and the east is all these handling charges; everybody working has to be paid; the elevator and so on, and the freight. In my own riding, as far as I know, the average profit to the dealer is \$2.00 a ton delivered to the customer. Consider what they charge us to grade it, \$3.00 to grade it, or 15 cents per 100 pounds; and when they take this wheat and mix it, it may happen that those who mix it sometimes are not good mixers; it happened in the case of a car of barley, that it was partly tough stuff and partly good stuff. I do not know who mixed it, but I was not so happy about it. I found out that the trouble

is with respect to this eastern part, and that the difference in price is because of gambling. The price of the thing is cheap if we buy it to be delivered in February, March, or April. Sometimes we make a profit, because the price rises during the winter. I have made some money on that account sometimes, and I have also lost some; but that is the difference, if I buy in August to be delivered in January, February, March, April or May. It happens that sometimes there is a big bargain in April, maybe 50 cents per 100 pounds for the stuff which I bought before.

Mr. Ross: You get a refund on the freight.

Mr. Gour: We all have that \$6 a ton adjustment; but I mean that I am trying this fall because the crop did not look too good in my district, and I may try to buy 10 to 15 cars to be delivered in February, March, April or May. Sometimes there is a big margin, that is the margin where someone makes money. Last year I lost some because the delivery was in the last part of July and the price was different when I bought before. I think we should have some place in the east here for a farmer to buy his grain in the fall so that it may be right on the spot when he needs it in January, February and March, when most of the time there are high prices in the east here, that is, in February and March. It begins to slow down in April, and it drops in May; and we could carry the grain a year to be delivered, because we buy it cheaper in May and June than we can buy it in February. I have been a dealer for a long time, 28 years, handling sometimes 50 to 75 cars, and I think the margin should be stopped, if we are to have a chance to have good storage in the east to bring our grain in, in the fall, in November and December.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you pass the freight assistance on to the purchasers?

Mr. Gour: How could you fool the public? You do not stand for fooling in politics, and you do not stand for it in business.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on section 11?

By Mr. Wright:

Q. With regard to the matter which Mr. Gour raised with reference to storage in the east and the board moving grain forward to the east while the navigation season is open, I understand that you had some discussion with the eastern people in regard to that, did you not, last winter? What were the conclusions reached at that conference?—A. I attended the Canadian Federation of Agriculture meeting at Macdonald College last winter. I told them on behalf of the board that we were not prepared to put grain into eastern positions unsold, that we felt by doing so we would weaken our bargaining position and we would lose alternative markets which we might otherwise obtain by keeping the grain at the lakehead. I suggested to them that if they felt there was a wide margin in the handling of their grain they should set up their own buying organization and we would sell them all the grain they wanted to buy and they could put it up wherever they wanted to in eastern Canada.

Q. There are government elevators available in eastern Canada to store that grain if they were prepared to buy it?—A. Yes, sir, there are places where they could put the grain up for storage.

Right Hon. Mr. Howe: They are all public elevators down east.

By Mr. White:

Q. I have a neighbour who tells me that he owns a grain farm out in the west. He is a cattle producer here in the east and he cannot ship a carload of his own grain to his farm here. Is such the case?—A. If the circumstances are such as you describe, that is quite correct. The grain in western Canada is being pooled, it is all going into one pool and the grain is being sold to the

best advantage of all the producers. Now, if we permitted people to ship grain into eastern Canada and take advantage of the market there, your pool would soon break down. There is no reason why he should not turn his grain into the pool like everybody else and buy his grain for use on his eastern farm, or wherever it might be. If you allow those diversions from the pool, your pool will soon break down.

Q. It is very nearly like a monopoly on the part of the government, then?

—A. Well, I do not like the use of the word "monopoly".

Q. Well, what is it?—A. We handle all the wheat, oats and barley on behalf of the producers of western Canada, with the exception of registered seed.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is very much the same as your tobacco board here in Ontario or your corn board.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Or the white bean board.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Can I ask one question? The Minister of Agriculture informed me that farmers in British Columbia should buy their grain in carload lots in order to supply the large chicken farms in the Fraser valley, but the transport officials discourage that by delaying the cars on sidings forcing the farmers to buy grain from the local dealers. Could the farmers in the Fraser valley buy their grain requirements in carload lots?—A. Well, if you ask them to go into our Vancouver office, you will find we are quite prepared to provide grain for them. I would just point out they would have to set up some kind of a system to be able to ship it and take delivery of it. That could be done through their own co-operatives in British Columbia.

Q. I do not mean that. I am just asking for information because Mr. Gardiner told me he could not understand why we did not buy grain by the carload. Of course we are not used to any farms with 5, 10 or 15 chickens on it, but in British Columbia we have farms with 5,000, 10,000 or 20,000 chickens. Mr. Gardiner said he could not understand why a farmer did not buy a carload and from what Mr. White said it seems to be clear enough. The farmers inform me in the Fraser valley that for some unknown reason the Board of Grain Commissioners, or some other body, say that you buy from your own dealer in British Columbia or you don't get it.—A. I do not think it is correct, Mr. Cruickshank.

Q. Mr. Chairman, Mr. McIvor just said a minute ago we could buy through co-operatives. We can have 15,000 turkeys on a farm in the Fraser valley, but we cannot buy a carload of grain. Why can we not buy, or can we buy? The minister says we can and the farmers of the Fraser valley say we cannot, and I presume from your statement a little while ago we cannot do it.—A. Your question is a little complicated, but I will try and answer it as best I can. When a farmer buys grain in British Columbia he likes to have a grade guaranteed. He just does not like to buy a pig in a poke.

Q. That's what he gets though.—A. Well, he might, but I rather doubt it. What we do in that case is we arrange for one of the elevator companies who are handling the grain on behalf of the board to offer the farmer the grain and they guarantee the weights and the grades. Now, if you want to buy a carload of grain of any kind, or any of your friends want to do that, if you will let me know I will see that the grain is offered to you.

By Mr. Roberge:

Q. Could anything be arranged for the eastern farmer to have storage facilities in Montreal, for instance, to operate for the benefit of the farmers in eastern Ontario and in Quebec, so that in the case of a calamity or in the case of a transportation tie-up or a bottleneck, the eastern farmers would not have

their supplies curtailed. Could something not be arranged so that the farmers in eastern Canada could have the same privileges as the farmers have in the Vancouver area, for instance?—A. You mean obtain storage space in Montreal?

Q. Yes.—A. I think you could arrange that, all right.

Q. Well, if that could be done I think that would be a great help to the eastern farmer.—A. That would not be a question for us, that would be a question of the National Harbours Board elevators in Montreal providing you with storage space.

Q. Now, if an arrangement of that sort could be made it would be of great benefit to the east. We ought to have the same privileges here as farmers have in Vancouver and in other parts of the country.—A. I am not sure exactly what you mean. If some organization in the east wishes to arrange bin space in eastern elevators and buy the grain at the lakehead, take it down here and put it into the elevators, we would be glad to facilitate that.

Q. I have another question along the lines of the questions asked by Mr. Cruickshank, regarding shipments in Quebec, where we have a law that all grain has to be certified grain without any bad seeds in it, and the quality of the grain has to be abided by. That is the reason that I was given for not shipping direct from the farmers in the west to the farmers in the east.—A. During the war there was a great deal of farmer to farmer, or rather country to country transactions, with affidavits as to weights and grades from elevator agents, and I am advised it was not very satisfactory as far as the east was concerned. They preferred to get grain from the terminals, of specified government grades.

By Mr. Major:

Q. Assuming that a co-operative, or one of our dealers, wishes to deal directly with the Wheat Board in the west, could they buy their wheat directly from you and pass it on to us?—A. That is right.

Q. The reason I am saying this is I am not altogether of the opinion that it is advisable to buy our own feed individually because we are equipped for production and possibly are not equipped to handle a carload of wheat and do all the work required, such as unloading, storing and bagging, while others are equipped for that purpose. If the regular dealers could buy it and do all that handling for a nominal charge, if our co-operatives or dealers could do it that way we would get the benefit of it.—A. Yes, you will have to take the grain from us up at the lakehead and ship it forward. I just wanted to point out to this group the suggestion was made by Mr. Gour, that if you bought grain in the fall and held it through to the spring, that you would realize quite a profit. I would suggest you take a look at the price of barley last fall and compare it with the price today. You will find anyone doing that would have suffered a very serious loss.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I take it from you that in no circumstances can a farmer buy feed wheat or coarse grains from the west unless he purchases it from the Wheat Board?

The WITNESS: That is right.

Mr. HETLAND: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to have the impression left that Mr. White has left here, that there is a monopoly out west. If this farmer he mentions belongs to the pool and he delivers his grain to the elevator there, he has a certain advantage. If he buys it down east he gets the benefit of the freight assistance, but if he ships it direct he cannot get the benefit of that freight assistance.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is right.

Mr. HETLAND: He will get the interim payments, also.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Mr. White understands pooling just as well as you do.

Mr. HETLAND: Yes, but he said it was a monopoly and I don't like to leave that impression.

Mr. WHITE: It still is.

Mr. HETLAND: No, it is not. You can still buy your grain.

Mr. MACKENZIE: But if you can only do it through one source it must be a monopoly.

Mr. HETLAND: Oh, no.

Mr. WHITE: Oh, yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, when we have the answers to the different questions I asked a breakdown of, that we will be able to ask some further questions with regard to the information supplied; in other words, we can come back to the section we are passing.

The WITNESS: That is all right with me, Mr. Wright, if it is with the chairman.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Mr. Chairman, there is usually a delay after the beginning of the crop year before the elevator companies are in a position to pay the farmer cash for the grain he delivers. Would you explain to me why that period of delay, and if it could be shortened in any way? Farmers often have to take the grain in and then wait a considerable time for settlement.—A. Yes, the reason for the delay is that the board, particularly in the last several years due to the crop damage, felt it advisable to delay fixing the initial prices for other than the basic grades as long as possible because we want to get some idea of the grades of the crop. Now, during that period the companies are not in a position to pay the initial price, by issuing cash tickets. They can take the grain in and the farmer will be given an advance on which we pay the interest. We pay the storage as well. So he can deliver his grain. He is not hurt except that he has not had the initial payment fixed.

Q. Well, if the farmer is taking grain in on the 1st August, the board starts buying, shall we say, the 20th August, if I remember correctly, from the time the word comes out that the elevator company is prepared to issue a cash ticket there is very little time in which the farmer has to sell that grain before storage begins. Am I right?—A. No, we pay the storage up to the time that we can make settlement with him, and the interest.

Q. I know at our local point, where the mail service is very poor, the elevator man told me he had about two days to notify all his customers that he was ready to buy the grain. Storage begins after that period and he said it was because of lack of telephones in that area that he could not notify the farmers, and he ran into a lot of grief that way.—A. I haven't heard of any.

Q. What length of time after the word comes out is there free storage?—A. We usually allow about two weeks. The period varies, but we announce it at the time.

Q. You mean, if a farmer had his grain in three weeks before storage, then after the elevator companies are ready to issue a cash ticket he would have another two weeks?—A. No, I do not think that has happened. I do not recall any case where the farmers had to pay storage and interest due to the fact that the board did not announce the price during the time.

Q. Perhaps I am rather dull, but when the elevator company gets word that it can issue a cash ticket is there a period of free storage following that notice if the 15 days has already passed?—A. No, there is not.

Q. That is the point I am making.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I think there is.

The WITNESS: I do not think so.

Mr. RIDDEL: When the initial payment is announced by the board we usually notify the companies that purchases should be made within a definite period; that is, two weeks after the initial payment is announced; and we will assume free storage on purchases made up to that time on grain delivered prior to the announcement of the initial payment. Last year, due to certain circumstances where elevator agents had not received the information in time to make the purchases, we did extend the date of payment by some days.

Mr. ARGUE: And that is your practice.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jutras.

Mr. JUTRAS: I just wanted to make a suggestion to the chairman of the board. Possibly a little more instruction or information could be put out on that score. Last fall there were a great many farmers who were quite worried because the 15 day period had expired. The price had not yet been announced and they figured they would pay storage. They did not know anything about the arrangement, and apparently for one reason or another the elevator men did not know or did not pass it on to these people. This was almost general in that particular community for quite a time, and no one was clear in their minds at all as to whether the board would actually take care of storage up until the price was announced. And then I would like you to consider also the possibility of giving a little publicity or information as to when you will be in a position to announce your price. You remember last fall the particular circumstances. You were, I think, contemplating announcing a price and then there was a very heavy rain in Saskatchewan and that delayed the announcement for another two weeks. At that time there were many farmers who had to arrange their financing, to make loans at the bank, and if they had known, for instance, when the price would be announced, in two weeks or so, it makes a lot of difference when you are negotiating a loan at the bank; but if they have no idea of when you would set the price, I think even the bankers, a great many of them, would have been equally glad, although it was reasonable to assume that it would have been within at least 15 days, or within not more than 15 days. Possibly if something was put out to this effect it might clear up the minds of a lot of people and eliminate a lot of worry on their part.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would think there would be an approximate price.

Mr. ROSS: It was due to weather conditions, was it not, Mr. McIvor; it was due to weather conditions last fall, the rains were very heavy. If it happens to be due to weather conditions, if we have conditions of that kind again it might not be possible to indicate the date of issuing the announcement.

Mr. JUTRAS: I am not asking them to set a date, I am merely asking them to announce when they will set the date.

Mr. RIDDEL: In the first place, initial payments for the top grades—that is in the case of wheat, number 1 northern; in the case of barley, 3 C.W. six-row; and in the case of oats, 2 C.W.; the prices payable were announced well ahead. They have already been announced for next year. There are two things that enter into the fixing of prices for the other grades. First of all, we have to have some idea of the constitution of the crop, whether it will be a low grade crop or a high grade crop. If it is going to be a low grade crop or a tough and damp crop, naturally the price for these grades will have to be lower than would otherwise be the case. The second factor is that before country prices can be determined we have to conclude our own arrangements for the handling agreement with the elevator companies to determine whether the spread will be 3½ cents, 4½ cents of 5 cents, whatever the payment may be.

Mr. ARGUE: What was the period of free storage from the time elevators were in a position to issue cash tickets last fall?

Mr. RIDDEL: Well, Mr. Chairman, under the Canada Grain Act when a farmer stores his grain in the country elevator he is allowed a period of 15 days there and then I think it was sometime in September last year when we announced the initial payments and we allowed a period beyond that. So that on grain taken prior to that time the producer was allowed the free storage period and from then on the board assumed the storage up to a period beyond the announcement of the initial payment.

Mr. ARGUE: The regular period of free storage and beyond the announcement?

Mr. RIDDEL: Yes, up to the time it was purchased by the elevator agent, then the deadline fixed by the board which was several days beyond the announcement of the initial payment.

Mr. ARGUE: Could you tell me how many days?

Mr. RIDDEL: I am not sure but I think it was 10 to 15 days.

Mr. ARGUE: I think if that period of time was known and it was kept constant from year to year the producers would be better off.

Mr. RIDDEL: It was well known by press announcement and I believe we also made several radio announcements last fall giving that information.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on section 11?

By Mr. Wood:

Q. Our farmers had trouble last fall. They were not able to borrow money on their storage tickets although they had the elevators full of grain and they were waiting and waiting to see what the initial price was going to be and they were not able to get any money on these?—A. Would not the elevator companies give them an advance on the grain in storage?

Q. No, they would not give them anything at all on the cash tickets.—A. It seems to me they should have given them advances on the storage tickets.

Q. We have there the Pool and Patterson's.—A. Well, the elevator companies always have been willing to advance money on grain stored in elevators. I do not know why they would not in this case and, as I said earlier, we would absorb the interest on the advance.

Q. Well, I do not know—maybe it was the fault of the fellows operating the elevators. I would not say but they refused to give the farmers any money on the grain in that town.—A. What was that point, Mr. Wood?

Q. Teulon.—A. We will certainly look into that when we get home.

By Mr. Jutras:

Q. You see, that is something to do with the initial prices announced. Well, usually that is announced in the early spring. They may not pay attention to it in the press and then by the time the fall comes along it has already been announced and it is not brought to their attention and as far as they are concerned there has been no price announced whatsoever and no clue as to when it will be paid. That is the point I am bringing up.—A. I think we will have to take it from the discussions that have taken place here that there are some complaints and I can assure you that as far as this year is concerned we will see that the widest possible publicity is given to the points that have been raised in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Are we through with section 11?

Agreed.

Section 12—Oats and Barley.

The WITNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, this section is part of the section dealing with crops and supplies. I do not think I need go into that. The second part deals with legislation and if I may suggest it, Mr. Chairman, perhaps if there

are any questions on this, on oats and barley, we can deal with the whole of the section rather than trying to deal with it piece by piece and probably make more progress.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed, that we deal with the whole section?

Agreed.

The WITNESS: Are there any questions on those two points, oats and barley and legislation?

The CHAIRMAN: That is on page 12.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Do you usually find it difficult to market a substantial quantity of oats in the early part of the year so that an interim payment can be made on oats?—

A. Well now, this particular year is a very unusual year in regard to oats and barley. The estimated marketings of oats are 126·8 million bushels which, I think, is probably a record figure and of barley 119·7 million bushels. The marketings of oats and barley have been on a record scale and one matter that concerned us a great deal was whether the oats which were lying out in the fields would be recovered this spring which would have quite an effect on our sales policy.

The last questionnaire figure that we have received indicated that both with regard to oats and barley the great bulk of the grain has been salvaged this spring and we have a marketing problem of some proportion in regard to oats.

I am hoping that we will be able to make substantial sales and the exports so far have been most extraordinary. The exports of oats from August 1st, 1951 to June 5, 1952 are 49·5 million bushels compared to 23·2 million bushels for the same period in the previous year. The exports of barley were 50·4 million bushels as compared to 17·9 million bushels.

Now, the situation with regard to an interim payment on oats was that frankly we advised the minister that we did not feel that our selling had progressed to the point where we could recommend it and having in mind factors which were not yet resolved.

Q. How have the deliveries been of oats and barley?—A. The deliveries have been very, very heavy.

Q. Is there much more, would you think, to be delivered?—A. In the province of Manitoba 83 per cent of the oats have been delivered, 86 per cent of the barley; in Saskatchewan 76 per cent of the oats and 85 per cent of the barley; in Alberta 77 per cent of the oats and 85 per cent of the barley; for the three provinces 78 per cent of the oats and 85 per cent of the barley.

Q. Then the delivery and sales position might be cleared up to the point now where a payment would be possible, don't you think?—A. Frankly I do not like to talk too much about sales. We are in the process of trying to market this crop. I do not think you should press me too much to talk about our sales position because this information immediately becomes public but we are very pleased with the sales of oats and barley recently but we have still quite a quantity to come forward to market.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. Mr. McIvor, what accounted for the increase of oats and barley last year over the year before?—A. Well, with regard to barley, the demand from Europe has been exceptionally heavy and also we have had a very big business with Japan. With regard to oats the demand has been very substantial in the United States.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. With regard to the handling of the oat crop on page 18 is indicated the amount you received each month and the amount that was sold during each month. In September and October your receipts were quite heavy representing 16 million bushels and better in September and 15 million bushels in October and your net sales during those months were 7 million and 11 million. Are these sales all represented in cash sales or are they represented in futures?—A. Some are futures and some are cash.

Q. You have no division as to what amount the cash sales are as against the future sales in these months?—A. Yes, it is in there, Mr. Wright. If you will look on page 16 on the left-hand side the board sold 87.9 million bushels in the futures market and 14.3 millions bushels were sold flat.

Q. I suppose your heaviest sales in the future market would normally be in the months of September and October when your receipts are heaviest?—A. Well, in selling grain in the futures market, of course, you have got to take into account how fast you will get the grain forward to terminal markets and, as it was stated yesterday, we had a very delayed harvest in the fall and we did not know frankly just how the grain was going to come forward.

Q. That was the point I was trying to get at. Is the sale of oats on future in September, October and November so that they get moved forward into eastern positions? I do not suppose they are moved until somebody purchases them, either on future or at cash; but if they are purchased on future, are they then in a position to accept grain against that movement forward while the navigation season is open?—A. If the grain is actually at the lakehead, yes.

Q. The matter then is one of the physical obtaining of the grain in the country and getting it to the lakehead before navigation closes?—A. That is right.

Q. I see; and that is the bottleneck, if there is a bottleneck?—A. That is the main problem, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions, Mr. Wright?

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What was the position in the year under review with regard to that? How much of the oats and barley were moved forward while navigation was open, and how much had to be moved forward later under assistance; and what is the position with regard to this grain being moved forward, and with regard to the freight assistance which the Dominion Government pays?—A. I have not any information on the freight assistance. We just sell the grain at the lakehead and we do not know how much there is on which freight assistance is paid. That would be a matter for the Department of Agriculture. I wonder if the minister could give us any information?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Freight assistance is paid to the ultimate buyer of the grain, and if the grain is moved out by boat, there is assistance paid on the moving plus assistance to the delivery point. I understand it all works back from the buyer to take account of the route which the grain follows.

Mr. WRIGHT: If it goes down by boat, it would mean a considerable saving to the government in freight assistance.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is right.

The WITNESS: Dealing with your question, from August 1st to the close of navigation in 1951-1952 there were 31.4 million bushels of oats shipped by boat. I have not got the car figures; but in the previous year there were only 18.3 million bushels shipped by boat.

Mr. WRIGHT: You mean in the year we are dealing with here?

The WITNESS: Yes; and in 1951-52 there were 29.4 million bushels of barley shipped from August 1st to the close of navigation as compared with 15.9 million bushels in the previous year.

Mr. WARD: Does the freight assistance carry right through to the country destination on feed grain?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is my understanding. There are certain laboratory allowances; I do not think it is figured out exactly, but there are certain allowances to get the grain to the bay port, and certain allowances to move it into the buyer's possession.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? I think that will bring us to section 15 on page 21, "Payment division", or have we covered that already? Are there any questions on section 15?

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to ask a few questions on the barley pool with regard to malting barley. Have you any figures as to the amount of malting barley that was sold to the Canadian Maltsters, and the amount of malt barley that was exported in the 1950-51 crop year, and what the percentage of it was as compared with the total barley?

The WITNESS: We have not a breakdown of that, Mr. Wright.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Why are your interest figures and bank charges on oats account and barley account so low relatively as compared to wheat?—A. Would you mind asking the comptroller that question? Mr. Earl will answer any of those questions. I am not too familiar with them.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on the barley pool?

Carried.

Shall we go to page 21, section 15? Are there any comments on the Payment Division?

Carried.

Section 16; 17; 18. Any questions on any of those sections?

Mr. WRIGHT: Just a minute till we see what is involved here.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What are the total numbers employed by the board in staff and officers? —A. On July 31, 1950 the figures on the right-hand side, 660, and July 31, 1951, 702. The reason for the increase is largely because of the fact that we took over oats and barley to handle. Our present figure, as I recall it, is, I think, around 670.

Q. There has been some reduction then?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. What happens to cheques payable to producers you cannot find and you have finally to give up?—A. Mr. McNamara says we have not given up yet.

Q. You are still looking for them?—A. We do our best to seek out these people and pay them the money and I can say we are having a little difficulty with some of them in getting them to cash their cheques.

Q. Probably they are lost.—A. I do not think they are "lost".

The CHAIRMAN: Can we pass on to section 18? That brings us over to the financial statement on page 22. It is just about one o'clock.

Are there any questions on section 18?

Carried.

We will adjourn now until 3:15 this afternoon. We will meet in this room.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order please. Before commencing on Part II, the Financial Statement, I think possibly Mr. McIvor has an answer to a previous question.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, the question was asked this morning as to what the breakdown was between the sale of feeding grades of wheat for export and for domestic purposes. Now, these are entirely the straight grades. I have no figures on the tough grades.

No. 5 wheat exports	—41·7 million
Domestic	— 3·6 million
No. 6 wheat exports	—17·5 million
Domestic	— 5·7 million

Feed wheat, that is the feed grade of wheat exports 1·8 million.
Domestic — ·8 million.

Those are all in millions of bushels.

One other point that has been raised with me privately by one of the members relates to the question of issuing of a boiled down report to western producers because many of these producers do not have an opportunity of seeing our complete report. We felt it advisable to wait until after we had had this meeting with your committee but I can advise you that that matter is under way now and there will be a boiled down report issued to country elevators so that producers may obtain it and have a chance to read the highlights of the board's operations.

Mr. George H. McIvor, Chief Commissioner, Canadian Wheat Board, recalled:

By Mr. Argue:

Q. It will be sent out to country elevator agents?—A. That is right, yes.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. But, Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to send it out with the last cheque and the last payments? The farmers will get it with the cheque. If you leave it with the elevators half of them won't pick it up.—A. There will be a considerable amount of delay if we do that and then I think if we are going to issue the report it should be a report that at least gives the highlights of the operations and to put it in the mail with the cheques might be a very expensive operation whereas sending it out in parcel lots to the country elevators every farmer will have an opportunity to get it and read it.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Part II, the financial statement.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would like Mr. Earl, our comptroller, to deal with these matters and before he does so there were two or three questions which Mr. Wright asked this morning and I will ask Mr. Earl to deal with those questions also.

Mr. EARL: The question was asked this morning by Mr. Wright for a breakdown of the figure \$578,957.27 representing the handling, stop-off and diversion charges. That figure consists of the following items:

Diversion charges—\$299,055.63 which includes \$26,159.46 diversion charges on shipments to the port of Churchill during the 1950-51 crop year; elevation charges \$128,907.37; stop-off charges \$137,727.75; inspection and weighing \$27,843 for a total of \$593,533.75.

The CHAIRMAN: Not too fast with the numbers please?

Mr. EARL: From that figure there were normal freight credit adjustments totalling \$14,576.48 giving a net figure of \$578,957.27 as shown in the financial statement.

Mr. WRIGHT: May I comment on that? You say that the diversion charges to Churchill are \$26,000?

Mr. EARL: \$26,159.46, that is correct.

Mr. WRIGHT: I had some figures tabled with regard to diversion charges to Churchill this year which indicated \$134,000 some odd, as I remember it, for diversion charges to Churchill.

Mr. EARL: That was freight, was it not, Mr. Wright?—\$132,000 odd?

Mr. WRIGHT: I would have to get the question to check on that. I thought that it was diversion charges that I had asked for, what the total diversion charges were and I am not sure the figures were on freight. As I remember the figures the one was \$137,000 and the other \$134,000. So that there was a difference between the two charges on freight and the cost of the diversion charges.

Mr. EARL: Well, I might say this, that figure covers the calendar year. Part of that diversion charge will be in last fall which will not be included in this report. This balance of the diversion charges on Churchill shipments will apply to the 1951-52 crop year.

The other question I believe you asked, Mr. Wright, was with respect to the country carrying charges portion of the \$22 million item. I would ask you to look at exhibit 2, if you would.

The CHAIRMAN: What page, Mr. Earl?

Mr. EARL: There is no page, sir; it is just exhibit 2 after page 29. The figure you originally discussed was \$22,447,953.72 on page 10 and you will note a breakdown of it there in exhibit 2—country carrying charges \$17,120,041.48. Now, as far as we can determine from the records we have with us the storage portion consists of \$12.6 million and the interest portion \$4.5 million.

Mr. ARGUE: Interest on money borrowed?

Mr. EARL: That will be interest we pay to the companies for purchasing wheat from producers which we do not pay for until it is put into a deliverable position.

Mr. ARGUE: You pay them at what rate?

Mr. EARL: At 4 per cent. The other question you asked, Mr. Wright, was with respect to drying and reconditioning charges totalling \$527,275.67. All I can say in respect of that figure is that it is the net cost to the board for its drying operations and I regret that I cannot supply you with the detail at this time because I have been unable to obtain the figures. I shall obtain that figure and see that you receive it.

Mr. WRIGHT: It was made up of costs of drying. I understood from Mr. McIvor that the board did not do that work, that the companies did it?

Mr. EARL: It is the cost paid for drying.

Mr. WRIGHT: Cost paid for drying to the—

Mr. EARL: Terminal elevators.

Mr. WRIGHT: And to the country elevators. Does any of that go to the country elevators?

Mr. EARL: No.

Mr. WRIGHT: None goes to the country elevators?

Mr. EARL: No. I believe one other question that you asked, Mr. Wright, was in respect of the item of \$3,284,000 odd representing additional differential charges, storage and interest, etc. Here once again I regret I cannot give you

the detail on that but it consists primarily of the carrying charges recovered at 6 cents a bushel on domestic sales from June 15th 1951 and IWA sales after August 1. I would say that 98 per cent of the figure consists of those recoveries. The balance would be small adjustments.

Mr. WRIGHT: There was one other question with regard to (c), additional freight costs \$35,972.39.

The CHAIRMAN: Where is that, Mr. Wright?

Mr. WRIGHT: On page 10—(c). I was wondering whether that was an item which indicated the cost to the board of, say, moving Alberta wheat to Port Arthur and Fort William as opposed to the freight rate which would be on that wheat if it were moved to Port Arthur and also what the net gain of the board was on wheat moving to Churchill in recovery of freight. They pay the freight from the local point to Churchill but the farmer has to pay the freight from the local point to Port Arthur and there is a recovery by the board of certain costs resulting from that?

Mr. EARL: That is true.

Mr. WRIGHT: And there is a loss involved if they move wheat from Alberta to Port Arthur and pay the grower on the basis of the Vancouver freight rate. I wanted a breakdown of those figures.

Mr. EARL: We have that here, Mr. Wright. Unfortunately I missed that but we can get it for you very shortly before the session is over.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to say a further word on the diversion charges. Mr. McIvor indicated that these diversion charges have been in effect for a number of years and that the grain handling companies are jealous of retaining the right to levy these diversion charges. Despite that fact and despite the evidence given by Mr. McIvor on it, I still think there is an inequity in it as related to the port of Churchill and Prince Rupert, where the diversion charges are made against all grains at those ports, and I think that the board should give some further consideration to the matter as to whether these diversion charges could not be removed on grain going to Prince Rupert and Churchill particularly. I have no objection to the diversion charges as far as the mills are concerned; and as Mr. McIvor stated, they pay those diversion charges themselves, and they get a real service for it; but I cannot see that there is any service rendered, so far as the grower is concerned, in the diversion charges on grain going to Churchill or to Prince Rupert.

Mr. McIVOR: I can assure you that we shall try once again to have the diversion charges eliminated, and if you can give us some help in that direction, we will be very happy.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. It is in your hands.—A. No, it is not.

Q. You make the deal with the handling companies?—A. That is right.

Q. And it is a matter of arrangement between you and the handling companies.—A. But there must be two parties to the deal. We cannot dictate to the handling companies. We try to come to an agreement with them, and I think that, without going into too much detail, we have a very satisfactory agreement all the way around.

Q. I agree that you have had a very fair deal with the handling companies, and I think so far as our charges are concerned, that is the only point to which I have any objection.—A. I assure you that we do not accept their first proposals. In fact, our meetings usually last 3 or 4 days and we try to get the best agreement that we can; but they have been adamant on the question of diversion charges to Churchill and to Prince Rupert.

Q. I think that is all I can say on the matter, other than to express the opinion and ask that you do what you can.—A. We will do the best we can.

Q. Yes, and see that the matter is brought up for discussion.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Would it help the sale of wheat to Port Churchill if it was f.o.b. Churchill?—A. It does not affect the sale of wheat one way or another as far as the diversion charges are concerned.

Q. I was speaking to Mr. Earl. You save 4 cents on 7 million bushels, and that would be about \$280,000, and that represents about 1/10th of a cent per bushel on 240 million bushels, and I should add 400 million bushels that you sell. That saving is not very much to the average farmer, that 1/10th of a cent; and do you think you could sell more wheat in a buying country? That extra 4 cents does not amount to anything to the farmer.—A. No, I do not believe we could.

Q. You do not think they would try to buy 4 cents cheaper rather than to go to Port Churchill?—A. There are a number of factors related to the sale of grain out of Port Churchill; for example, there is the length of the season, and the number of boats which can get in there; and our board indicated to us that when they were able to obtain some saving in the movement of wheat through Churchill, it was a satisfactory deal as far as they were concerned.

Q. They get the saving?—A. They do not get it all, but they do get some of it.

Q. Would it help if you gave them all?—A. No, I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions before we start on Part II?

Mr. EARL: I can supply Mr. Wright with the answer to his question on the Churchill diversion and the freight saving on shipments to Churchill; it totalled \$132,217.22; and the extra cost involved in the shipment from Alberta points to the lakehead amounted to \$96,244.83, leaving a net figure which is shown in the accounts, amounting to \$35,972.39.

Mr. ARGUE: I asked a question this morning about the interest paid on bank charges in 6-B, and whether the Wheat Board had some surplus money at any time in this crop year, and if so, how would it be invested?

Mr. EARL: It did; and it wasn't invested, because it is not available for a sufficient length of time that we can invest it. If you look back over the pattern of the last two crop years you will find that in the early part of each year and in the fall, we are involved in making payments to producers, which involves a very heavy expenditure of cash. But the board has the authority to invest its surplus funds.

Mr. ARGUE: In treasury bills?

Mr. EARL: That is right, or in any other securities which may be agreed upon; but it is impractical to do so unless the money is going to be available for a reasonable length of time. Consequently it has been left on deposit with the banks and has earned the bank rate of interest.

Mr. WRIGHT: Where you have a surplus in your wheat account, do you use it in your wheat account, or do you use it in your oats and barley accounts if it is necessary to use it there?

Mr. EARL: Very definitely, otherwise we would have to borrow from the bank for each account at a much higher rate of interest.

Mr. ARGUE: On what proportion of your money do you pay 4 per cent? On some of it you pay 4 per cent to the elevators?

Mr. EARL: That is correct.

Mr. ARGUE: To cover money they borrow and money you borrow yourself, and you pay $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. EARL: No, $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent from the bank.

Mr. ARGUE: Could you give me an idea of the amount on which you pay 4 per cent and the amount on which you pay $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, and what proportion of it is paid over to the elevator companies for interest?

Mr. EARL: That figure would be the figure which I gave to Mr. Wright; it was, roughly, 4.5 million dollars; and the carrying charges—I am sorry, but that is not included in this figure; you are dealing with the \$1,710,000 item. There is another factor which comes into that problem. We pay interest on advances received from agency sales; and that interest is paid at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. This interest amounted to \$1,204,999.88; in addition the \$1,710,000 includes interest to the mills as part of the mill carrying charges, amounting to \$429,393.87.

Mr. WRIGHT: Are there any regulations in effect now with regard to the proportion of number 4 wheat that the mills may use in their mix for flour?

The WITNESS: When we started in with this, in this crop year, we decided that our Canadian mills should use proportionately the same grades of wheat that we sent overseas because we did not feel it would be right for them to be taking the cream of the grades and sending the balance overseas. We watched the situation very carefully and we change the formula from time to time; but they take, as closely as we can calculate it, the same percentage of grades that go into our export markets.

Mr. WRIGHT: That still obtains?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. What is the mix? Is it about 3, or a little lower?—A. It is just exactly what we have at the time; it varies depending on how the grade comes forth from the country; but the predominant grade this past year has been No. 4. The only No. 1 northern we have had has almost become a museum piece this past year, it was so small.

Q. Has there been any change in the interest rates you have had to pay the bank in the last few years?

Mr. EARL: Yes; until recently it was 3 per cent, but it was raised last fall to $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

Mr. QUELCH: I have a question, Mr. Chairman. Is the PFA levy paid on overages?

The WITNESS: I do not think so, no. No, it was not.

Mr. ARGUE: No recommendations?

Mr. QUELCH: Not from the pool anyway.

The CHAIRMAN: Are we going on now with Part II, Mr. Earl?

Mr. EARL: Part II deals with the financial accounts of the board for the crop year ended July 31, 1951. The preliminary part of the report quotes the amendment to the Canadian Wheat Board Act, which is the basis on which these accounts were drawn. They were drawn on the basis of transferring the unsold balances in the wheat, oats and barley accounts to the subsequent pools. The table in the middle of the page will show the dates, quantities, etc., involved in these transfers, and which are the bases for the completion of the accounts in order that final payments could be issued to the producers.

Mr. ARGUE: Is this exhibit I you are referring to?

Mr. EARL: I am just dealing with the preliminary part of it, Mr. Argue.

The CHAIRMAN: You are on page 22, Mr. Earl?

Mr. EARL: Page 22, that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: In the middle of page 22, those figures in the centre of the page.

Mr. EARL: The first statement to be dealt with is the consolidated financial position of the board, which is set forth in exhibit I, and in each of the subsequent sections we have made a number of comments as to the contents and the make-up of the various items that appear on exhibit I. Perhaps I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, if it is agreeable, I do not see any particular point in going through all these sections unless somebody has some specific questions, because they are merely statements of fact as to what appears on the consolidated balance sheet. If it is agreeable, questions might elicit more information.

The CHAIRMAN: You would suggest we turn over to the consolidated balance sheet?

Mr. EARL: That would be my suggestion, and deal with the questions on it because these statements here are merely statements of fact in support of the items on that balance sheet.

Mr. WRIGHT: We were given some figures earlier with regard to the amount of feed wheat, 5 and 6 feed wheat, that came to eastern Canada, in proportion to the amount that was exported. I wonder if we could get similar figures as to the amount of oats and barley consumed in eastern Canada, or in Canada outside the three western provinces, that would be British Columbia and the east here, as compared with the amount we export.

The WITNESS: We do not have the same kind of record on oats and barley because we sell our oats and barley at the lakehead. I think, however, that you could obtain from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the amount of oats and barley that has been used in Canada and the amount that has gone out of the country for export.

Mr. HETLAND: On this 95 million bushels on page 22 which shows carrying charges recoverable on this wheat, the wheat that was taken over. You mean to say, then, that all other wheat was sold previous to this, and this is all we have to sell from last year's crop, 95 million bushels?

Mr. EARL: That is correct. That is the amount that was transferred to the 1951-1952 crop.

Mr. HETLAND: And the other wheat was sold?

Mr. EARL: That is right, as of the date of this table.

Mr. HETLAND: So actually there were only 95 million bushels taken over this year.

Mr. EARL: That is correct.

Mr. ARGUE: That transfer shows October 20, which means some of the sales in 1950-51 were in the 1951-52 crop year.

Mr. EARL: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. ARGUE: On exhibit II—

The CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Are we done with exhibit I? Are there any more questions on exhibit I?

Mr. WRIGHT: On exhibit I, I would like to ask with regard to the Canadian Wheat Board building in Winnipeg, on which is shown as \$411,000 less depreciation. How much depreciation has been written off on this building, and the same with regard to the office furniture and equipment.

Mr. EARL: We have written off five years, \$7,800 per year, which represents 2 per cent of the cost of the building per annum.

Mr. WRIGHT: What do you depreciate your equipment, automobiles, etc., at—a higher rate?

Mr. EARL: Very much higher, yes. The furniture and fixtures we write down at the rate of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. The automobiles we depreciate generally along the same system used by the income tax department, 20 to 25 per cent, and so on.

Mr. BRYCE: But there are a lot of machines just rented?

Mr. EARL: That is correct. All our IBM tabulating equipment is rented.

Mr. BRYCE: And you do not pay any depreciation on these?

Mr. EARL: No.

Mr. WRIGHT: Just why do you rent? Is it because you cannot buy?

Mr. EARL: You cannot buy that equipment, you must rent it.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on exhibit I?

Carried.

We will turn over to exhibit II, statement of operations.

Mr. ARGUE: You show export sales under terms of the International Wheat Agreement at 97 million bushels. Now, why is this figure so low?

Mr. WYLIE: Please talk louder, we cannot hear that whispering.

The CHAIRMAN: Speak up when you ask questions so every member will hear the question.

Are you on exhibit II?

Mr. EARL: The answer to that question is that the balance of these International Wheat Agreement sales for the same crop year would be reflected in the 1945-49 pool account. We had two open accounts for part of that year and the sales would be allocated to both of them.

Mr. ARGUE: The 1945-49 account was kept open until December 31, 1950, is that right?

Mr. EARL: That is correct. There is a short summary of that on page 27, showing the finalized surplus calculation.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions in connection with exhibit No. II?

Mr. CARDIFF: What does that diversion charge mean, is that for transferring wheat from one elevator to another, or what is it?

The CHAIRMAN: Could you repeat your questions, please, Mr. Cardiff?

Mr. CARDIFF: I am asking what does that diversion charge mean.

The WITNESS: Would you like me to answer that question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I presume Mr. Cardiff was not in for that part of the meeting when it was answered before.

Mr. CARDIFF: If I was not, then I will see it in the evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on exhibit No. II?

Carried.

Exhibit No. III—statement of operations.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. With regard to your sale of futures in oats and barley, do you purchase any futures at all or are you merely sellers of futures?—A. We do not purchase any futures in the terms of the word "purchase". We sell futures in the first instance and then when we sell the cash grain we take back the futures.

Q. You just take up the amount you sell on cash account?—A. Yes. We are not permitted to purchase futures.

Mr. HETLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. McIvor does he still think that the system that we use now in selling oats and barley is the best system?

The WITNESS: I will answer that question by saying that we seem to be getting along all right under it and while it is not perfect, like everything else, we feel that the system we are following is the best that can be followed at the present time.

Mr. HETLAND: We find all kinds of criticism of it in the west.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. With regard to the sale of futures, are you governed in the amount you sell of these futures by the availability of transport to move the grain forward; or what would be the governing basis in the amount of futures you might sell at any given time?—A. The first governing factor is if we can sell the futures at a price we feel is a fair price at the time without necessarily depressing the market too much or at all; and, secondly, we don't want to sell anything we haven't got; so we have to be guided by the amount of grain that we get forward.

Q. That would be the amount that you have in the country elevators or in storage at Port Arthur and Fort William?—A. We take into consideration the whole quantity, the amount in the country elevators and the amount in storage at Fort William—Port Arthur; but we have to keep in mind that the oats and barley that are in the country elevators are not in a deliverable position and we have to use our best judgment as to how much we think will come forward.

Q. It would be governed then to a certain extent by the amount of shipping available?—A. To a very considerable extent, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on exhibit III?

Carried.

Exhibit IV—oats and barley.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Have you had any representations from anyone with regard to a larger premium being offered for malting grades of barley?—A. Do you mean can we get a larger premium?

Q. Yes, that is what it would amount to. It seems to me the premium on malting barley these last two years has not been sufficient to justify the farmer for the additional work and the lower yield that he might have on malting barley and as a result I think probably we are getting less malting barley than we would if the premium were greater; and there is a certain area in Manitoba and Saskatchewan which could be growing larger quantities of malting barley if the premium were sufficient to justify it.—A. Well, there are really two premiums; there is a premium which the malting company pays to the farmer—and they apparently feel that they can get a sufficient amount of barley at the present premium. Then there is the premium that we try to obtain in the sale of barley to malting companies or for export; and in the case of export, the export demand largely governs the premium; and we found ourselves on several occasions where we had the premium at a point where we could not sell the malting barley and we had to put the premium down. Barley quality in the last two years, due to weather, is not as good as usual and some of the American malting companies do not like our malting grade of barley. That applies this year and it applied last year.

Q. I think over the last three or four years the inclination has been to lower our quality of barley because of the fact that the farmers did not consider the premium they would obtain enough to justify greater production.—A. The real difficulty with malting barley in our case, both last year and this year, is the fact that so much of it contained too much moisture and had to be dried, and in the drying process some of the hulls were split and it was not satisfactory

for malting and had to be sold overseas for feed. Now, that is a real problem. If we get a dry year this year and get the right type of malting barley I think we will be able to re-establish the market.

Q. Have you any figures as to the amount of malting barley that has been sold by the board to the United States.—A. I don't have those figures, Mr. Wright, the only figures we have are the totals, and we do not know how much of it actually goes for malting.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Have you any idea of the percentage of barley sold for malting purposes?—A. It is a very small percentage of the whole, it is a matter of quality.

Q. Is that largely because the barley we raise is not satisfactory for malting purposes or that there is no sale for it?—A. There is and always has been a limited demand for malting barley. If I recollect the figures correctly, the total demand in Canada is about 7 million—about 7 million for our own maltsters, and the amount the Americans would take depends entirely on the quality of the barley; but I think the demand for barley in the last year or two has been for feed and overseas, Europe and Japan, and that is the only kind of demand we could have that might possibly support the amount of barley production in this country.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions on exhibit number IV?

Carried.

Exhibit V—statement of the amount due to the government of Canada. Are there any questions on exhibit V?

Carried.

Exhibit VI—statement of operations, oats and barley account—P.C. 1292.

Mr. WARD: There is a question I would like to ask there, Mr. Chairman, on this oats and barley account. I see that the surplus as of July 1950 amounted to \$6,729,866. I also see that in respect to this surplus the Canadian Wheat Board paid \$6,324,789.99 to the government of Canada on the 31st of March 1948. What would that consist of?

The WITNESS: I will ask Mr. Earl if he will answer that, Mr. Ward.

Mr. EARL: This particular statement deals with order in council P.C. 1292, which became effective in March of 1947. Now, the operations on the account actually had been completed sometime prior to this report, and under the terms of the order, any surplus realized on this account were to be paid into the consolidated revenue fund of the government of Canada. Now, I may say that there has been considerable delay in making settlement because there are certain difficulties in relation to it at the present time. As soon as it is cleared up payment will be made of that money to the Government.

Mr. WARD: It will not be returned to the producers?

Mr. EARL: No, it will be returned to the government of Canada as required by that order.

The WITNESS: This order in council 1292 directed the board to take over all the oats and barley in Canada and there has been a good deal of litigation about it and it was recently settled before the privy council in London.

Mr. BRYCE: It has been settled now, hasn't it?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What did that litigation cost; if that is a fair question?—A. As that is an operation on the part of the dominion government I could not answer that.

Q. It did not cost the board anything?—A. It did not cost the board anything, no. We were acting on behalf of the dominion government.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on exhibit VI?

Carried.

Exhibit VII—statement of refund account.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What is that item: refund paid to millers and processors of wheat products, \$5,678.59?

Mr. EARL: This too, Mr. Wright, is the remains of an account operated whereby a subsidy was paid on domestic wheat produced and milled in Canada for human consumption. We have been unable to complete the rag-tag end of it. In the next exhibit, you will note the drawback account which is exactly the same type of account. The result is that we must carry these accounts until such time as we are able to complete them, and at that time any surplus in the accounts belong to the government of Canada and will be repaid to them.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall exhibit VII carry?

Carried.

Exhibit VIII—statement of drawback account.

Mr. WRIGHT: Again there is the suggestion of excess profits received through the operation of the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Limited, adjustment of excess profits received from that corporation, in the amount of \$22,648.42. Just how does that arise?

Mr. EARL: I cannot tell you exactly how that arises except this that when the drawback regulations were in effect and the excess profits tax became effective, there was a provision in the drawback regulations, requiring certain adjustments of drawback in respect to mills in the 100 per cent excess profits bracket. We were directed by the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation to make these adjustments which I understand originated direct from the income tax department. The Board simply disposed of government funds in accordance with instructions received from these sources.

Mr. QUELCH: What were the funds invested in?

Mr. EARL: To finance our own operations.

Mr. BRYCE: What per cent of drawback was there—

The CHAIRMAN: Would you mind repeating that, please?

Mr. BRYCE: What was the drawback to the miller? Could you explain that?

The WITNESS: I wonder if I might go into that, Mr. Bryce?

Mr. BRYCE: Yes, sure.

The WITNESS: It is a great many years ago, and if you remember at one time the price of flour in Canada was calculated under the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at a ceiling price of 77 $\frac{3}{4}$ ths per bushel of wheat going to the mills.

Mr. BRYCE: That is when the farmers subsidized the nation.

The WITNESS: No, not in this case, Mr. Bryce. Then the wheat was sold to the miller at the current price and the millers received a drawback through the board from the government to permit them to maintain the price of flour and bread.

Mr. BRYCE: Is that still being paid to them?

The WITNESS: No, this is an old account which has been carried on. I do not know how far it goes back, a good many years. We are just waiting to clear it up.

Mr. EARL: It has been cleared up as of the date of this report, very definitely.

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall exhibit VIII carry?

Carried.

Exhibit IX—statement of final payments to producers?

Mr. WRIGHT: What about these balances payable to producers as at the 31st of July, 1951? Are you trying to contact some of these old accounts? What percentage of them are being cleaned up?

The WITNESS: I am going to ask Mr. Davidson who is in charge of that work if he would tell the committee just what efforts he is making to get ahead.

The CHAIRMAN: Who is Mr. Davidson?

The WITNESS: Mr. Davidson is secretary of the board.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Our payments department has worked on this almost continuously, particularly in connection with the older accounts where the balances are getting pretty small. From time to time we furnish our inspectors in the country with a list of names of the producers who have money coming to them, and by personal contact we are gradually whittling this amount down. In some cases the payments have to be made to an estate and our legal department are continuously working there trying to get the money paid to the proper parties. On the more recent accounts of 1945-1949 pool for example; as at July 31st we had \$8,364,000 on hand, and these accounts are still quite active. The foot-note at the bottom of the page indicates the rate at which these accounts are being reduced. In the six month period from August 1951 to the 31st of January 1952 the board paid \$4,884,513.31 in respect to this liability, that amount was distributed. The amounts in the early accounts are not very large, the amounts that we are holding now, relative to the sums that are paid out, and every week there are some of these old cheques being issued.

Mr. WRIGHT: Do you notify the local elevator agent of these accounts?

Mr. DAVIDSON: Yes, they have had lists.

Mr. ARGUE: There is no policy followed of advertising these amounts for the benefit of people who may not know that they have money coming to them; you just travel around and try to get them paid up?

Mr. DAVIDSON: No, they are gradually being worked out.

Mr. MacKENZIE: I see here that \$65 million was distributed through the Wheat Board?

The WITNESS: Oh, yes.

Mr. FAIR: I think Mr. MacKenzie was not so much interested in that as in the amount that was paid out in the form of subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would you mind repeating your question, please, Mr. Wood? I would like to know from Mr. McIvor if he is of the opinion that the payment of that \$18 million in a freight subsidy is justified.

The WITNESS: I am afraid that is out of my field.

Mr. ARGUE: Yes, that would be under the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on exhibit IX?

Carried.

Exhibit X—statement of provisions for final payment expenses.

Mr. ARGUE: What is the cost per cheque of making interim payments or final payments, for example?

Mr. EARL: I am unable to give you that, Mr. Argue, but I can obtain it for you.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to ask a question which I asked before with regard to paragraph—

The CHAIRMAN: Would you speak up, Mr. Wright, please? Order, please.

Mr. WRIGHT: I asked a question earlier today with respect to a comparison between the per bushel cost for administration for this year as compared with former years, I think it was 3·84 cents.

Mr. ARGUE: No, it was ·384.

Mr. WRIGHT: ·384 rather, and during last year it was somewhere around that amount, maybe just a little lower. Have you the comparative figure?

Mr. EARL: Yes, I can give it to you. For the year 1949-50 it was ·455; for the year 1948-49 it was ·516; for the year 1947-48 it was ·577; for the year 1946-47 it was ·389; for the year 1945-46 it was ·399—is that far enough back?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes. It indicates that our costs are really going down as far as administration is concerned, the per bushel cost.

The WITNESS: Keeping in mind the volume I think our administration is reasonable. And I am very pleased with the cost of administration, but you have got to look at it from the standpoint of bushels handled.

Mr. WRIGHT: I may say that I agree with you too. I think our costs are going to be lower.

Mr. HETLAND: Why did Mr. Wright say 3· something?

Mr. ARGUE: It was ·384.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am sorry, I made a mistake.

Mr. HETLAND: Oh, that is different.

Mr. WRIGHT: I should have said ·384.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall exhibit X carry?

Carried.

Are there any further questions in connection with exhibit X?

Carried.

Exhibit XI—administrative and general expenses.

Mr. ARGUE: What were your legal fees and courts costs for the year?

Mr. WARD: Now, Mr. Chairman, I see in connection with final payments that you have certain costs which are set out here in the report. I wonder if you could tell us how that was distributed? Are we going to get that, who really gets it?

The WITNESS: Those were the costs of making the payments, Mr. Ward, as allocated to the different accounts.

Mr. WARD: And distributed in that way?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Earl is going to answer a question which was asked by Mr. Argue.

Mr. EARL: Your question was with respect to the item: legal fees and court costs and what are these costs for?

Mr. ARGUE: That is right.

Mr. EARL: They were in connection with charges resulting from deliveries in excess of quota, deliveries of grain at delivery point not referred to in the permit, etc. They also include certain expenditures in respect to the Nolan case, and generally such legal matters relating to the operations of the board.

Mr. ARGUE: How many were involved with producers? You referred to that earlier in the report. If you will refer to page 21, item 16—how many of the 70 prosecutions were producers?

Mr. McIVOR: All of them.

Mr. ARGUE: Were there no elevator agents involved?

Mr. McIVOR: Producers and elevator agents.

Mr. ARGUE: I want to know how many were producers and how many were elevator agents.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you speak up, please; people are not getting what you say down at the other end of the room.

Mr. EARL: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to make a correction in the statement I made in regard to an answer I gave Mr. Wright. You were asking, Mr. Wright, about our rates of depreciation. The correct figures should have read automobiles 33½ per cent, furniture and fixtures, 33½ per cent and office equipment 10 per cent.

Mr. ARGUE: Is that a third per year or a diminishing balance?

Mr. EARL: No, it is based each year on cost.

The WITNESS: Mr. Argue, I am sorry that we haven't the information you asked for as to the number of producers and elevator agents involved, they were all included in this figure; but I would like to say to the committee that a great deal of our legal work relates to estates where there is an argument between parties as to who should get the money. I would say that 75 per cent of the work that goes in our legal department, which is necessary, has to do with that type of thing.

Mr. ARGUE: You have almost no trouble either with the producers or with the agents?

The WITNESS: It is very small when you compare it with the millions and millions of bushels that are handled.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bryce.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. Do the permanent employees have the benefit of superannuation?
—A. Yes, they have if they are within the proper age group.

Q. You have a great many people in your employ, what is the percentage of temporary employees?—A. Mr. Earl could answer that question for you.

Mr. EARL: It is rather difficult to give you specific figures on it Mr. Bryce; it depends on the time of year. For instance, at the moment we will have a fairly large number of temporary employees to take care of the present permit problem, and, likewise, during payment operations, it usually becomes necessary to employ additional help; there is really no fixed quantity, it is just a matter of expediency.

Mr. BRYCE: It would be the equivalent of seasonal employees?

Mr. EARL: Very definitely, yes.

Mr. BRYCE: What I was really driving at is that some of the departments of government have so many temporary employees that are temporary for 20 years. You don't follow that practice?

Mr. EARL: No, definitely not.

Mr. BRYCE: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on exhibit XI?

Carried.

Now we come to the auditor's report, part III. Are there any questions with regard to the auditor's report?

Mr. WRIGHT: Just a question with regard to that. Has any consideration been given to having these accounts audited by the Auditor General of Canada rather than a private auditor?

The CHAIRMAN: Louder, please.

Mr. WRIGHT: My question was: has any consideration been given by the board to asking the Auditor General of Canada to audit the Wheat Board account instead of using a private firm?

The WITNESS: Frankly, no. We have been quite satisfied with the audit arrangement; and I might say that this firm of auditors appointed in 1935 has been auditing our accounts ever since. I think a suggestion did reach us at one time through a Senate committee that we might consider having our account audited by the Auditor General; but, frankly, I do not know what advantage it would be, the costs are not too heavy when you consider the volume of operations.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Is there a running audit made throughout the year or is it just a year end audit?—A. There is both a running audit—someone can correct me if I am wrong about this—and an end of the year audit.

Mr. EARL: Yes, there is a general, continuous audit and an end of the year audit.

The WITNESS: I might point out that there is a provision in the Canadian Wheat Board Act requiring that we have an independent and separate firm of auditors examining into our affairs.

Mr. ARGUE: That is independent from the Wheat Board's own auditors; isn't that what it means?

The WITNESS: I would not think so.

Mr. EARL: The Act requires that we have an independent firm of chartered accounts examine the accounts of the board.

Mr. WRIGHT: But isn't it correct that there is a continuous audit going on in the wheat board account?

The WITNESS: That is quite right, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on the auditor's report? Carried.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the committee when I say that we appreciate the very able and co-operative manner in which Mr. McIvor and his associates have answered questions directed to them. I think the Canadian Wheat Board is to be highly commended for the very efficient manner in which they have handled the farmers' wheat in the past, especially when you consider the very adverse weather conditions under which this grain has been harvested. Therefore, I take pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in moving that the report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the crop year 1950-51 be adopted, and that the chairman so report to the House.

The CHAIRMAN: You have all heard the motion. Is it agreed? Carried.

The WITNESS: May I make just a few remarks, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself and my associates. I wish to state that we are very pleased to be here to meet with this committee. It gives us an opportunity—and the only opportunity we have—of putting before a public forum the story of our operations, which, if they are read merely in the report, are perhaps not properly understood. We do try to write a report which is readable, and we try to give in it the maximum amount of information. At least those are the objectives towards which we direct our efforts. I would like to take this opportunity of thanking the members of this committee through you, Mr. Chairman, for the courteous hearing which we have received from your committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McIvor. Now, we have Mr. Phelps with us. I do not know whether it is agreeable to Mr. Phelps and to yourselves that we proceed immediately with the Farmers' Union, and to have them present their brief at this time. There is a meeting set for 8:15 tonight, but if it were agreeable to Mr. Phelps and yourselves, we might start and have Mr. Phelps present his brief now and continue on for a while this afternoon. What is your pleasure, gentlemen? 8:15?

Mr. CHARLTON: Mr. Chairman, many of our members have already retired.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well, we shall adjourn now until 8:15 tonight.

Agreed.

EVENING SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Now, gentlemen, we have with us this evening Mr. J. L. Phelps who is the president of the Interprovincial Farm Union Council and president of the farmers' union of Saskatchewan. The Interprovincial Farm Union Council, I may say, represents the farmers' unions of the three western provinces, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I think probably you have all received copies of this submission of the Interprovincial Farm Union Council and I think we will proceed this evening as we did with the Wheat Board report. We will ask Mr. Phelps to read his preamble here and then each section following that and we will take up each section at a time. I will now call upon Mr. Phelps to address you in connection with this submission.

Mr. J. L. Phelps, President of Interprovincial Farm Union Council and president of Farmers' Union of Saskatchewan, called:

Mr. LAING: Might I ask a question first, Mr. Chairman? I wonder if Mr. Phelps could enlighten us as to the position he holds in the Interprovincial Farm Union Council and how big the council is—

The CHAIRMAN: A little louder, please, Mr. Laing?

Mr. LAING: And whether or not you are affiliated with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

The WITNESS: The Interprovincial Farm Union Council was organized in 1947 and it comprises the farm unions of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan; inclusive of course of the B. C. block which is also included in the Alberta organization. So far as any affiliation with the federation is concerned the Manitoba farmers union have never been members of the federation; the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union have been members of the federation until last spring—the first three months of this year—the Alberta Farmers' Union are still maintaining their connection with the federation. But the Interprovincial Farm Union Council, as I say, was organized in 1947 with branches in the three prairie provinces.

By Mr. Laing:

Q. Are they all grain growers?—A. All grain growers and other branches of agriculture are eligible for membership. There are affiliated with us a few members who have been taken in on that basis, but they are very few because it is left up to the locals themselves to decide in any case that a person is not a bona fide farmer; sometimes he is a man who is more or less on the line, but that is left to the local union to decide. I would say that in very few cases is that the case. But in order for a person to vote on policy matters or to be a delegate to a convention of a farmer's union in Saskatchewan then he must be resident on or actually operate a farm at the time the convention took place, otherwise he is not permitted to vote on policy matters.

Q. Could he be a poultry man?—A. Oh, yes, that is a branch of agriculture.

Q. How many members have you?—A. About 115,000.

Mr. LAING: Thank you very much.

The WITNESS: Before I start, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Mr. Howard Britton, from Manitoba who is a member of the board of the Manitoba Farmers Union. I might say that I must apologize for two of our delegation, two members have not arrived and we haven't been able to locate one of them—we don't know whether he is grounded or not—I refer to Mr. Wesley Coats who was to have been here at one and he has not shown up yet. I am very sorry that he is not here and I still hope that he will be here before the session is completed. The other one is our representative for Alberta, Mr. Hennig. We got word that he will not be able to get here until tomorrow morning. But in order to facilitate the work of the committee, Mr. Chairman, it is up to me and my associate here, Mr. Britton, to more or less carry on and try to finish the session. I hope you will bear with us and we will try to co-operate with you.

The prairie farm unions appreciate the invitation of the government of Canada, as expressed by the Right Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, to place their joint submission regarding urgent agricultural problems before this, the standing committee on agriculture of the House of Commons.

We sincerely trust it will become an established practice for this important committee to meet regularly each year during the sittings of the House of Commons, so farm organizations and other groups desirous of presenting recommendations for the improvement of the agricultural industry, may be provided with similar opportunity of presentation.

There are urgent problems requiring governmental attention, problems bearing both on the welfare of the primary producer and the larger community in general.

General economic conditions affecting western farmers

The prairie agricultural picture presents a changing pattern which, in some respects, reveals a serious situation which cannot be divorced from our Canadian economy as a whole. It is quite true that there are individual farmers on the prairies, as in other parts of Canada, who have, during the past years, considerably improved their financial position. We are concerned that a much larger percentage were not able to do so.

The very small percentage of relatively prosperous farmers, often cited by those who view the situation from a distance or the sidelines, are certainly not representative of the average prairie farmer's position.

Western Canada is witnessing what appears to be a strange phenomenon. While industrial activity is, in some areas and in certain lines, enjoying a near boom development, we are concerned to note that a section of our basic industry, that of agriculture, is facing what could easily develop into an agricultural depression, even in the midst of the so-called industrial boom. We realize that agriculture is, and will no doubt continue to be, the foundation of our Canadian economy. It is recognized the world over that foodstuffs are not only the first but primary requirement to maintain and sustain the world's population. Yet the world picture in regard to food production is one of decline in relation to continued increase in world population. The old saying used to be "starvation in the midst of plenty," but we are convinced that unless constructive forward-looking policies are adopted to provide more stability in the agricultural industry, food shortages may increase, and occur where they have not before been evident, while serious economic dislocation could result.

In this regard we would first draw your attention to the farm production costs which have, in many cases, been increasing and, in some instances, continue to increase.

Compared to increased production costs is the disturbing decline in farm incomes for Canadian farmers. Some of the reasons for this serious situation are not hard to find. First we have a situation where the price of wheat has been literally frozen for a considerable length of time. These prices may not have been too far out of line at the time they were negotiated four or five years ago, but as the cost of the goods and services farmers had to pay in the course of wheat production increased, the price ratio became more and more out of line.

Dairy, Poultry and Livestock Situation

More recently the price of dairy products declined sharply. This has been followed by similar lowering of hog prices, causing considerable loss of income to hog producers. Those engaged in the raising of eggs and poultry products are another group that have been, and still are, experiencing severe difficulties in the matter of drastic reduction in their prices; and finally, the Canadian cattle industry, while experiencing the beginning of a price decline to start with, has been thrown into a chaotic condition which threatens its very existence, as a result of the outbreak of the dread foot and mouth disease.

It would appear at the moment that it is no exaggeration to say the results of this combination of circumstances not only threaten the stability, but in many instances the actual continuation, of this important branch of food production in western Canada.

The immediate results are already apparent. Numerous livestock producers, both large and small, are faced, in many cases, with the distinct possibility of certain financial embarrassment; for some it may mean bankruptcy. Under such chaotic conditions stability is totally lacking, and we would emphasize the seriousness of dairy and purebred herds being depleted, which in some cases, particularly, represent many years of breeding, due to the fact that there is a total lack of incentive for many people to maintain basic producing herds. Once these herds have deteriorated or been dispersed, it will take many years to rebuild them or regain lost ground.

It has become increasingly evident that the dairy industry must be saved from ruin. Chaotic marketing conditions have brought us to the point where depletion of our dairy herds is reaching disastrous proportions. Canada has lost thousands of dairy cows during recent years, while milk production has decreased. Last winter, Canada had to import increased amounts of butter. In view of this fact, it is difficult to understand our government's recent six cent reduction on the butter support price.

We trust the committee will recognize the seriousness of the dairy situation and make proper recommendations to the government. When Canada, a sparsely settled country with abundant agricultural acreage, must import large quantities of butter—together with milk in dried form—then obviously something is wrong. Floor prices should have a fair and practical relation to production costs.

While we import butter we fail to export our cheese. As an example of the latter, the Saskatoon dairy pool has had to shut down its cheese factory, lay off 15 employees and allow \$40,000 worth of cheese-making equipment stand idle for the first time since 1935. The United Kingdom, once the ready market for Canadian cheese, has not now the Canadian dollars to buy our cheese. Britain wants and needs our cheese. We could use British manufactured goods. Here is another opportunity for the Canadian government to facilitate a barter deal with the United Kingdom.

The Canadian government is to be commended for its efforts to control the foot and mouth disease, since it was officially diagnosed and publicly recognized, as well as for the action taken in investigating, through the hearings of this Committee, the handling of this serious disease in its early stages.

While we would recommend any disciplinary action to be taken if negligence is proven on the part of any individual or individuals, we would nevertheless point out that the handling of the more important side of this whole question, namely, the drafting of a plan to meet such an unprecedented situation, leaves much to be desired.

While we are in favour, under relatively normal circumstances, of recommending to farmers the formation of a producers' marketing board as an essential part of a long range program, we believe this approach alone would not meet immediate requirements, at least until the present confused situation is clarified.

We would definitely recommend that the government should, without any further delay, treat the entire Canadian livestock industry as a national emergency, and that one of the immediate steps in such an emergency program include the establishment of a national marketing board on which actual producers themselves be fully represented; and that such a board be given the necessary power to establish equitable floor prices with proper spreads for the different grades and with sufficient safeguards for their enforcement.

This board should be given authority to ensure that producers receive their proper grades, establish delivery quotas if these are required, supervise and regulate the movement of livestock in various parts of Canada as well as to take complete charge of the marketing of whatever surplus meats are available over and above domestic requirements in other markets outside of Canada.

We appreciate the government's co-operation in having the Swift Current plant put in operation to process cattle. We would urge, however, that in view of Saskatchewan's (and Alberta's) recent unfortunate experience with provincial embargoes, the federal and provincial governments be requested to jointly assist in establishing an additional and permanent slaughtering and processing plant to be located in the eastern agricultural area of Saskatchewan.

More Stable Prices for Agricultural Products

It is becoming increasingly apparent that the present floor price legislation for various agricultural commodities is proving quite inadequate. In some instances there is fairly substantial evidence that the floor price which was intended in the first place to benefit the primary producer, has actually worked out in practice to be little more than a guarantee to the wholesalers, the processors and the packers. We have no doubt that the government had good intentions, but we believe that the need for a thorough overhaul should now be apparent, if our original objective is to be attained. Our recent experience would seem to raise the definite question as to whether or not any plan of equitable floor prices can be made to operate even reasonably efficiently, unless and until the group or board that is charged with the responsibility of administering it, is at the same time provided with the necessary control of the product itself.

Past, and more recent experience both serve to raise another very important question with reference to the marketing of farm products. From time to time throughout the years, and more particularly apparent recently, we find numerous examples of small exportable surpluses completely disrupting and sometimes quite demoralizing the market for the entire product. We believe that this must be guarded against in future, and that steps must be taken immediately to work out a satisfactory solution. We believe, therefore, that a national marketing board such as we recommend should be given powers and instructions to completely separate the marketing of agricultural products into two classifications. First, that portion of the product which is required for home consumption, the price for which should be established having due regard

to the cost of living index, and bear a proper relationship to the cost of goods and services required by a farmer in maintaining production. The balance, or exportable surplus, should be treated quite separately, and should not necessarily bear any direct relationship to the price obtaining on the domestic market. The exportable portion of the products might be sold for either a higher or lower price, or it might be desirable, and an advantage at times, to exchange at least a portion of the surplus food products for other goods on a more or less straight barter basis. Under certain circumstances barter becomes practical, we believe, when rates of exchange or the lack of a satisfactory medium or money do not readily facilitate trade.

Agriculture and International Policy

Farming is a labour, a business—and a way-of-life. At his best the farmer is a technician combining science and art in his work. Farming has long been, and must in the nature of things, continue to be, the basic industry of nations and peoples. Primarily man must eat. Food comes first. What else is accomplished, or striven for, comes after food. Whatsoever his individual circumstances or beliefs, the farmer's essential function in society is the production of food. This he wants to do and will do, if allowed to meet his production costs.

The world has many hungry people. The farm unions hold that everywhere hunger should be eliminated.

When our agricultural products are used as an instrument of international policy—comparable to the way in which tanks, ships and planes and related armaments are used—the farmer alone must not be required to bear the financial burden. Cost of the struggle for world power should be spread among the taxpayers as a whole.

Surplus is a term open both to interpretation and argument. It is a fact, however, that the United States government has seen fit to pay the U.S. grain producer a bonus on all grain stocks declared surplus. This actually is an additional payment to the producer, which helps to spread the cost over the entire population and on a more equitable basis.

We therefore urge this committee to recommend that our government make certain that the farmer is not required to bear a disproportionate share of the financial load in connection with the marketing of grain and other agricultural products tied to Canadian external affairs policy.

That brings us down to grain marketing and other problems.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments with regard to the clauses Mr. Phelps has just read from his submission?

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, would it not be well to complete the brief and then see if there is anything we want to ask rather than stopping at the end of the section? Would that not be better than taking it a section at a time?

The CHAIRMAN: That is what we are trying to do; deal with it section by section.

Mr. LAING: Mr. Phelps, on page 5, under more staple prices for agricultural products, there is an inferred criticism there of floor price policy—

The CHAIRMAN: A little louder, please, Mr. Laing.

Mr. LAING: Now, how do you suggest that the payments be made to the producers—let's take the case of ungraded eggs; you will agree that the only basis upon which they can be sustained by floor price is by the payment to the egg producer.

The WITNESS: After grading, anyway, but then they are not getting enough.

Mr. LAING: In other words, they might not be getting enough. They have to be graded, and it seems to me that is the only way in which a floor price could be sustained.

Mr. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, would the members speak a little louder? We cannot hear down here. Why doesn't he get up on his feet?

Mr. LAING: That must apply to a great number of farm commodities, I think you will admit that. It is the only point at which floor prices can be sustained.

The WITNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is matter of method how far it can be worked out. We cite as an objective in that regard the case that we just brought up. We think that at least there ought to be a minimum price which should apply when these eggs go into storage. We think that is one thing that should apply which is not, in actual practice now, working out in that way. But certainly, the only place where you could apply it is after they are graded in accordance with certain standards.

Mr. LAING: But they are paying 42 cents for the top grade.

The WITNESS: To a certain extent they have guaranteed that, but they guarantee that to the packers next fall.

Mr. LAING: No, it is 42 cents.

The WITNESS: If you knew the storage situation, Mr. Laing, you would know that it actually would be higher than that—you have to take into account the transportation costs they will be paying, it really does not mean a thing to the producer.

Mr. LAING: How in practice can the government sustain the floor price of that type on a commodity and pay it to the producer? That is what I am asking you.

The WITNESS: Well, it seems to us that it can be done in that case by saying that the packers would not be able to participate in the advantages of that legislation, and that has been told to them. It is not in the legislation but it has been told to them and since then those particular prices have jumped up—that unless they paid a certain price they would not get it, and now it is beginning to work. We have some packing plants where it is working out, but it seems to me that it is only working out in a very limited way; but, as I say, it is working out in some areas but in most areas the producers are not getting the benefit.

Mr. LAING: The same thing would apply when you are dealing with live animals; suppose you are dealing with beef?

The WITNESS: Yes, but with beef on the other hand a plan has been worked out, it is still in the experimental stage; but I think the Minister of Agriculture has worked out a plan that I have made some inquiries about that so far seems to be working not too badly; so I think it is a matter of working it out to meet these requirements. I say this: that the prices are not high enough—I don't think that is working out so well, but the mechanics of it can be improved upon.

Mr. Ross: Take the price of beef. Beef is handled on much the same basis with regard to floor price as in the case of eggs. Beef all goes into the packing plant and the way the floor is applied there is by paying a certain price for a certain grade, based on the top grades.

The WITNESS: I was referring to the new plan that has been recently instituted where the government sends a buyer through when they hold sales and on the basis of those sales they pay a floor price. In some cases people have been satisfied, but these floor prices should be on the grades. He bids the floor price and if anybody wants to bid higher, O.K., but he bids the floor price on the different grades and apparently that is working out better. I have

talked to some producers that sold cattle that way and they are reasonably satisfied with the way it is working. Now, they are not satisfied at the level at which the price has been established.

Mr. ROSS: That is only operating in one province?

The WITNESS: Yes, I understand it is only operating in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. FERRIE: Mr. Phelps, if you disagree with this way of handling as far as the packer is concerned, it is easy enough to say that but what idea have you of handling it any other way? You have your butcher cattle and you come into the two-way cattle and then you come into the stockers and feeder cattle. Now, what else would you ask as far as the butcher cattle are concerned, where would you set up a different set-up than we have with regard to the car cattle? I am not saying that I agree with it wholly, but I want to know your idea of what should be done under the circumstances.

The WITNESS: Well, you see, we say here what we are proposing is a national marketing board upon which the producers and the government, of course, would both be represented. This board would concern itself with two things, first of all they would concern themselves with the exportable surplus, which is a small percentage of our products. They could also establish floor prices and shall I say they could establish fixed prices for certain grades of meat within our own Canadian economy.

Mr. FERRIE: Yes, but just a minute. You have already got that. You have your red and your blue and your commercial grades. You have that already set. There is no argument to that. Your choice steers can go sky high, and that gives the farmer the benefit. If he has done something that is well worthwhile the trade can pay anything they like for them. Then you have the good steer that is set at 23·85 cents out in your locality, and when you get that 23·85 cents the farmer is not going to sell that for 20 cents. Now, what are you going to put in there as far as the marketing board is concerned? What are you going to do to benefit the primary producer? If there is any benefit that can be got for him I am right behind it, but how are you going to do it? You are not going to back the man on the farm, you are not going to say we will pay you so much for that steer out there, and he has to be brought to market, and when you get to market you have a floor on it. Now, there is no floor on a choice steer. He can go any place he likes, I mean the price. I mean there is no ceiling. Now, what are you going to do? You say the floor is not high enough, or what is the condition that you wish to pay more money, the system that you can get more money back to the primary producer? What is your way of doing it?

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, since this brief was written, the livestock situation is a changing picture and certain changes have taken place which it is pretty hard to appraise and to analyse and evaluate at the present time. As you know, the government has stepped in now and is actually buying cattle.

Mr. FERRIE: Yes, but just wait a minute. That stock is not feeders, they only take that away from the trade when they won't pay that floor. Now, the stock is not feeders. Anybody can take these stockers and feeders, the packers and anybody else. The trade is handling that business through the farmer. Anybody can buy stockers and feeders. You cannot say there is anything wrong with that, because that is an auction market. What I am trying to get at is this system with regard to the packer. The packer, as I said, has 3 or 4 grades. You take the red beef, the blue beef and the commercial beef. Now, commercial beef you jump either to two-way cattle, and they go to the States, and if you come east to this part of Canada, here you have an auction market that says that these cattle are to be sold under the hammer,

it does not matter who buys them. Some people in eastern Canada buy them and some people buy them and take them back to the farm. You cannot get away from that. You cannot get away from that price, and if anybody wants to go higher they get them. That is a market by itself and they do not want to go higher if the government is ready to take them and put them in the pasture. You cannot get away from that system. The packer system is what I am trying to get at. You said the system is wrong. What system have you to bring it back to the primary producers in those three grades?

The WITNESS: Gentlemen, in drafting this brief we were not only thinking of cattle, of beef, we were thinking of other products, dairy, poultry and what have you. What we are trying to do here is to suggest to the government a general plan. We have suggested that in view of conditions that did exist and have existed for a number of weeks, and I say the picture is changing so rapidly you just hardly know what is going on from day to day. I mentioned we have not had time to see the effect of this new plan. It has certain advantages if it works, and we will give it our blessing if it does, but it does seem to us a condition that has existed now for many, many weeks has been a situation where a small exportable surplus, which we all know is a minority of our production, has totally demoralized and disrupted the whole operation of our meat industry in Canada, and we think that in the best interests of the producer and in the long run the consumer—we ought to have a marketing board that would bring stability into the picture, and that one of the first things to do would be to take that surplus off the home market.

By Right Hon. Mr. Howe:

Q. Is the government not doing just that, taking the surplus off the market?
—A. Yes.

Q. They ought to do it—but they are doing it!—A. It is quite true there has been a move by the government and we are not critical of that.

Q. Why do you criticize then? What is the basis of your complaint at the moment?—A. We say this, that the situation has been chaotic throughout the last number of months, as you know. Now, maybe this is straightening out to some extent.

Q. Chaotic to the effect that your hogs have brought the highest price on the North American continent in the last several months?—A. The hogs have been marketed, you say, at the highest price?

Q. Yes.—A. Well, Mr. Howe, I would suggest to you if you should examine some of the records and the way slips that come into our offices of the hogs that are actually going over the scales, I do not think you would be of that opinion. That might be certain types of selected hogs you are speaking about, but it does not apply to the hog industry as a whole, certainly not in isolated instances but by a large number of reports that come in, and it is one of the best evidences I know of of the need for the very thing we are asking for.

Mr. ARGUE: What is the lowest return you saw for a young hog, overweight admittedly, but for a young hog?

The WITNESS: There are returns in the office ranging anywhere from 11 cents up.

By Right Hon. Mr. Howe:

Q. Have those complaints been entered with the Minister of Agriculture?—A. Oh, yes, sir.

Q. Has the situation been corrected?—A. I would say the situation is improving somewhat.

Q. Was it corrected when you entered a complaint that a hog was sold for 11 cents a pound? Was it corrected?—A. Not in that individual case.

Q. Now, I wish you would give us those cases. The Minister of Agriculture has told us in the House of Commons that where a complaint has been entered the situation has been straightened out.—A. We will be glad to give him a lot.

Q. Why haven't you done so already? Is your job to protect the farmer, or just to store up complaints?—A. I do not think that statement is hardly correct or called for, Mr. Howe, for this reason. I do not think our job is to take up individual complaints, if that is what you would like us to do.

Q. Well, what is your function? Why do you receive a complaint if you don't do something about it?—A. We do something about them.

Q. What do you do?—A. We have wired to the minister, not on specific complaints that I know of, but in a general way, and I want to say that I am not complaining about the reaction of the minister or the attitude he has taken on this.

Q. But what are you complaining about?—A. The lack of stability generally.

MR. ARGUE: Is it not a fact that there is no floor price on heavy hogs? There is a floor price on grade A hogs and B-1 hogs, but when these hogs were overweight, no. I do not see 11 cents, but I saw one for 13 cents.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: What did you do about it?

MR. ARGUE: I brought it up on the floor of the House.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: An adjustment was made?

MR. ARGUE: I do not know that, maybe I am mistaken but I understand an adjustment would take place on a hog of the correct weight, but coming back into A or B-1 grade, for which there is a floor—

MR. ROSS: How would you make an adjustment on these heavy hogs that were not classified for payment?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Do you know of any hogs that sold for 11 cents, heavy, light or anything else?

MR. ROSS: I have heard of some selling at 13 cents.

MR. ARGUE: Sows that never had a litter of pigs?

MR. ROSS: This floor price was marked on the A and B hogs, and these were heavy hogs.

MR. WRIGHT: Would you suggest in setting floor prices where floor prices are set, as they are on top grade at the same time the government should say what the spread would be between the various grades, would that assist?

The WITNESS: Very definitely it seems to us that that should be part of the machinery of any floor price plan. Now, it may be difficult for instance in the case when you come down to eggs. I do not know how it could be made to work. There certainly should be proper spread for the lower grades.

MR. FERRIE: Let us get this thing down to facts. Just because some buyer out in western Canada didn't play ball with the schedules—this sets the grades all the way down, and, as you know, I think there are 25 or 30 grades. They are set all the way down, the floor is set on the A-1 hogs and the B-1 hogs and from there down the schedule runs the same. But out in Saskatchewan they did not play ball and there was trouble with these scalpers going around all over the market and taking these hogs and they didn't do anything. They did not play ball. This government has nothing to do with it, just because some of them did not play ball. As far as hogs were concerned, they were defatted and put into the can. They have cost the farmer plenty of money as far as that is concerned. Right now the hog market in Saskatchewan is bad, but why worry about it. Let's get down to this proposition with regard to cattle and leave the hogs out of this situation. We have the hogs there, the best in the world. Let's quit fooling around and let's get down to the facts of this thing. We want to know what your idea is and what the idea of the unions is about getting

these floor prices working in the desired way. You say it is going to the packer. Let us see that it gets to the producer. That is where it should get to, it should get back to the producer. That is what I want to know because I am a producer and I am interested in the producer than in the packer; he gets plenty anyway. There must be some way of taking care of this thing and getting it back to the producers.

Mr. WRIGHT: Might I ask the speaker one question? I would like to ask Mr. Phelps as to what extent they have been successful in the application of the floor prices paid by the government? As I understand it, it is paid on the grade 1 hogs.

Mr. FERRIE: Sure it is; you are thick as the woods. That fixes the price and it applies right down the line on the different grades of hogs. They have already set the price of grade 1 hogs, but there are 23 different grade of hogs. The floor price is set on the grade A hogs.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright:

Mr. WRIGHT: I was going to ask the same question.

Mr. FERRIE: As Mr. Phelps has already stated, and as has been said before, there is a ceiling price, I mean a floor price set on hogs and it works out in certain cases. What I am asking about now is the floor price on the grade A hogs, and I want to find out, to follow this situation through and see how that floor price is going to apply along the line on the different grades.

Mr. ROSS: Well, you are right there; they set the price of the grade A hogs, and it goes right down the line to include all the different grades.

Mr. FERRIE: But it does not seem to be fair.

Mr. ROSS: That is the whole thing.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Now, gentlemen, I think this committee has dealt sufficiently with the livestock situation and I suggest that we move on to the next part of the brief. There has been plenty of discussion in the committee on this question of floor prices. Let us deal with wheat. I suggest that we take the next section of the brief that is at the top of nine.

Mr. WRIGHT: I had one question that I wanted to ask Mr. Phelps with regard to the latter part of the statement.

Mr. WYLIE: Mr. Chairman, we can't hear at this end.

Mr. WRIGHT: I said that I had one question I wanted to ask to Mr. Phelps with regard to the last part of his statement when he says, "when our agricultural products are used as an instrument of international policy; just what is he referring to there?"

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Yes, we can go into that in detail.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, if I might digress a moment, I hope that Mr. Ferrie gets this new schedule that is being talked about everywhere, because I am afraid the farmers have not been informed; that has not been made known to the farmers and I am only waiting for it, and I know, at least I hope it will be forthcoming.

Mr. ROSS: We have asked the Minister of Agriculture in the House to place it on the record, but we have not received it yet.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: You will get that subject in a few minutes.

The WITNESS: Certainly. In regard to the statement here there have been several statements made; but I think the position which is generally accepted is that one of the proposals is that Canada as a part of the international program is to provide cheap foodstuffs to other countries.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Well now, just tell us what foodstuffs we provide cheap.

The WITNESS: Well, I would like to refer to the speech made by the Minister of Agriculture himself in one of these towns here in Ontario on this matter, and it is reported in the Belleville paper here. I have two or three statements here and if you wish I will read them, and I agree that it is a fair statement. This is the speech which appeared in the Belleville paper. I was interested in the early part of it and it has been re-printed in some of the western papers. Here is what it says:

There has been criticism of our wheat agreement with Britain but the fact remains if there had been no wheat agreement Canada would not have been selling any farm products to Britain.

We just told them, the minister went on, that unless they bought other farm products they would have to pay the market price of \$3 per bushel for wheat.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: You are going back four to nine years now, are you not? Is not that water over the dam? Come up to date and let the committee know what food products we are selling on the basis of international policy.

Mr. ROSS: There is more than one policy involved.

The WITNESS: It has appeared to us, and I think that it is pretty well accepted, that that has been part of the program—

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: It has not been a part of the program.

The WITNESS: Across the line they are there following a similar policy and they assist their farmers, and we think that a similar program should be adopted here in Canada. If that policy is going to continue—

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: What has that got to do with the world? It is a matter of domestic policy in the United States and it still is. The policy of the U.S. is to buy and sell in the open market in wheat as well as other commodities. What has that got to do with the international situation?

The WITNESS: If we need concrete cases there are plenty, but we have got to get it working back and forth—

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Just keep up to date. We are dealing with next year's problems, this year's problems, and we have before us a report of the Wheat Board for 1951-52.

The WITNESS: That is quite right, sir. We are very much interested in what is going to happen, and you know we can always gain some hope by looking at things backward and see what has happened.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I thought you were coming here to present us with facts. Give us definite facts about the situation and don't generalize.

The WITNESS: On the current situation.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: This committee consists of some 60 members of parliament and they have a pretty good idea of how things stand today. We are coming to a late hour of the evening. If you want to take up your time in generalization, that is just up to you, but I think you had better get to something concrete.

The WITNESS: Well, as I say, we make the statement, and I believe if you would give us a little time—if you think it is a waste of time, sir, we will drop it and go on to some other point. I think there is plenty of evidence that can be brought forward to illustrate the point here that the member has raised.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: We have here some pretty able people, people who are dealing with these questions every day.

The WITNESS: I realize that, sir; I realize that, and on the other hand I think the farmers can pretty well appraise things as they work out so far as they are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we turn over then to grain marketing and other problems?

Mr. WARD: Before you leave that, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to Mr. Phelps that I am entirely in agreement with anything that is practical and will assist in improved economy for the farmer. There is no doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN: A little louder please, Mr. Ward.

Mr. WARD: He says in his brief, "here is another opportunity for the Canadian government to facilitate a barter deal with the United Kingdom"; and he even advises the government to make it possible for Canadian institutions to barter, to take their soft money, if you want to call it that, for our hard money—whichever way you like; to do away with that and to do it instead through a barter deal with Great Britain.

The WITNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is, I admit that we did not come here with a complete blueprint cut and dried with all the details. We did not think at this juncture that this committee would be interested in details. I would say this, if you want specific cases with regard to a barter deal we have a company organized in Saskatoon who wanted to get a type of tractor made in the Old Country—this is only a few months ago and they had everything lined up but due to the difficulties that I can't begin to explain because I don't know just what all was involved—they wanted to place an order for tractors in exchange for wheat, and they ran into so many difficulties in working it out that it was impossible for them to complete the transaction. Now, I do not know what all is involved. I think probably we have been thinking too seriously that the easiest way out of it was to use dollars, that that was the easiest way for accounting, and apparently we have not been able to work out any effective alternative. I am not advancing this illustration as a matter of any quarrel whatever, but rather in a helpful way. I would make a suggestion as to what we think might be done. Now, sir, if the government is interested and wants a committee of farmers to sit down and discuss the thing in some detail with them at some future date I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Howe, that the farmers will be prepared, will be willing and most anxious to do that very thing. But, as I say, at this time, it seems to me that we were mostly interested in the broader principle and general policy.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we go on to grain marketing and other problems?

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, the brief refers to a price system, and particularly I think there is the proposal of setting up a national marketing board. I presume that what you had in mind in that case would be for such a marketing board to have control over the marketing of all products in a way much similar to the Wheat Board, possibly as a part of that board, or, do you think it should function entirely independently.

The WITNESS: As we say in another part of the brief here, we have not actually worked out a plan of agriculture prices. It seems to us that it becomes more obvious all the time that the difficulties of making floor price legislation applicable with a board carries with it the implication that you must have control of the product.

Mr. HETLAND: Well, what is the answer?

The WITNESS: I do not think they are just ready to answer. I am sorry, sir; maybe I did not make myself plain. I thought it was the answer. It is very difficult to answer yes or no to some individual questions. Now, I don't want to be arbitrary about it, but just what point do you think is not answered?

Mr. WELBOURN: I want to ask you if you favour a board setting prices on all farm commodities?

The WITNESS: A board to set prices on farm commodities—that is another point, and I believe, sir, that the farm unions are in favour of the producers controlled marketing boards as part of the general policy. We are suggesting

here a national marketing board for meeting particularly the chaotic conditions which we see existing. But in addition to that we say that in ordinary circumstances, we would advocate the producer marketing his own product; and for this reason we have stated that we do not think that we are capable of dealing with a situation where such emergency conditions arise without having something in the nature of a producer's marketing board. At least, in our view, that is one way.

Mr. GEORGE: Are you against free enterprise in the marketing of farm products?

The WITNESS: Well of course, sir, I know that if I had to answer that question I perhaps might do it by asking you what is free enterprise, I think I know what you mean. But we would say this that the time has come for the agriculture industry to do something. I think more and more farmers are coming to the idea that we must have a means of controlling our products, that we cannot always be selling on a market under the so called law of supply and demand. Now, we have learned a bitter lesson to our sorrow in the past. We believe that proper basic prices for foodstuffs is in the interest not only of the producers but in the long term interest of the consumer as well.

Mr. WOOD: Whom do you mean by "we"?

The WITNESS: I would say we are the producers; certainly the farmers are the producers of agricultural products.

Mr. WOOD: You spoke about chaotic conditions. What about the stockyards to which you refer? What do you mean by the application of floor prices in the stockyards—particularly stockyards like St. Boniface?

The WITNESS: Well, sir, I do not know whether you were around, but if you had been out in Saskatchewan almost anyplace in the last three or four months it would not be hard for you to see plenty of evidence of the chaotic conditions.

Mr. ROSS: Well, are you sure that applies to all stockyards?

Mr. WOOD: I have put cattle in the stockyard at St. Boniface for 16 years. I do not think there is a better system in Canada for the handling of livestock than what they have there.

The WITNESS: Well, that system, or any system of support has been completely paralysed particularly over the last number of months.

Mr. WOOD: I do not think that they have been paralysed there, so far as I know. Everybody seems to be quite satisfied with it.

The WITNESS: Well, you are not getting that from the farmers' union council.

Mr. ROSS: Have you made a study of this selling by auction at public stockyards in Alberta as compared with the practice at St. Boniface? What are the practical possibilities of it? How is it working out?

The WITNESS: In some of the areas I understand the producers are pretty well pleased, in other areas it is not working out quite so good. I do not know that it has been in operation long enough yet to give a considered opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should go on to grain marketing and other problems.

Mr. ROSS: Before we leave that, could we have an answer to Mr. Ferrie's question with regard to hog prices?

Mr. FERRIE: Yes, I want to know how it works out in Saskatchewan. The floor price, as I understand it, is 25 cents on grade A hogs in Winnipeg and then it applies right down the line to all the other grades all the way down.

Mr. BRYCE: Price is the factor, the government never sets it by grades, they just set it on the top grades, and after all, it really is not the government who sets it.

Mr. FERRIE: Well then, who does set it, who else sets it?

Mr. BRYCE: The packers set it, and it is based on what they think they can get for live hogs.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. STUDER: Mr. Chairman, before we leave that point, have the farmers' unions made any recommendations on this here so-called non-payment of floor prices—what is being paid to the packers instead of to the producers? Has the farmers' union made any recommendation to the Saskatchewan government about the way this thing is working in the packing plant. And, I was wondering whether they had done anything about this model packing plant which it was proposed that the Saskatchewan government would take over. Did you recommend that it should be handled in that way, by taking over the plant and seeing how it would work out?

The WITNESS: We have not only recommended to the government of Saskatchewan but we are recommending it here, that the government of Saskatchewan in co-operation with the federal government should do something about having more packing plants in Saskatchewan. I think the Saskatchewan government could assist the farmers in this respect.

Mr. HETLAND: That is very interesting.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that we have covered the ground on this section of the submission quite thoroughly.

Mr. LAING: There is just one point I want to ask Mr. Phelps. Would he suggest a change in respect to the payment of the floor price from the packer to the producer in the case of cream that might be 23 or 33 per cent butter fat or eggs that are ungraded and might be one-half on bloods and cracks. There has been a suggestion in the House of Commons that more of it should go back to the producer. I want to ask him by what means he would suggest that. I suggest it cannot be done.

Mr. ARGUE: Put a price on cracks. You have a price on feed wheat.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would say this to all members of this committee, that the farm unions will stand ready, sir, to sit down around a table with any group selected in good faith, sir, and with the object in view of working out a plan. We have certain suggestions and certain ideas. I have been asked for a specific plan. I believe that ways and means can be worked out. You cannot make a blue print that will be perfect to start with, but by trial and error we can work out something, and I assure you the farmers' union will be prepared to work that out.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: May I ask you one question, Mr. Phelps? Is it important for you to get this brief before the committee?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Well, why don't you get on with it, then?

The CHAIRMAN: Grain marketing and other problems. I think we better go over that now.

Grain marketing and other problems

We have previously referred to the discrepancy between farm incomes and production costs. This situation has been seriously aggravated in recent years, due to the policy that has been pursued by the Government in requiring that domestic wheat be sold at the same price as that of the International Wheat Agreement. This is definitely a gross injustice to western farmers. On this point we want to emphasize the fact that western farmers are the only group penalized in this manner. Farmers in other parts of Canada enjoy much higher prices for their wheat right in our home market. Oftentimes both western wheat and

wheat from other parts of Canada are being handled by one broker. As a result of western farmers being forced to accept IWA prices for wheat sold on the domestic market, our wheat prices in Canada bear no relation to production costs, or the goods and services the farmers must buy.

In actual practice the domestic wheat price has served as a form of subsidy to the Canadian milling industry, but it has not prevented a number of price increases for milling products, notwithstanding the fact that wheat prices have been virtually frozen during this same period. We would, therefore, urge that this Committee recommend to the Government a complete separation of the price of domestic wheat from that sold under the International Wheat Agreement, and further, that the domestic price of wheat be established and maintained at a price bearing a fair and proper relationship to the price index in other branches of Canadian economy, as well as to the goods and services required by farmers in their production costs.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Now, just on that, you refer to the fact that eastern wheat is sometimes sold at a higher price than western wheat. Now, you know the reason for that as well as I do. You know the eastern farmer prefers to sell his wheat on the open market without any guarantee, without any floor price protection. Now, if the western farmer wishes to do the same, there will not be the slightest objection from the Canadian government. As the minister responsible for the operations at the present, I will welcome such a development.

Mr. FERRIE: You are only going to be able to do it over my dead body!

The WITNESS: That is a good farm answer. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if the minister expected me to answer that question. I do not think there is a question here. We want to make it clear that it is not a question with us of orderly marketing or of going back to the Grain Exchange method of marketing. No, it is not that choice. We want control of marketing and we want it through the Wheat Board, sir. We will make that plain later on in the brief. There is no question of where we stand on this point.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I can make it plain that as a matter of government policy the Canadian government will not tax the consumers of this country to bonus the wheat producers of western Canada. I think those who are negotiating a new wheat agreement should know that if they cannot negotiate a price that represents a fair price for wheat for the people of western Canada without an additional bonus from the consumers of Canada, they had better not negotiate any price.

Mr. LAING: Hear, hear!

The WITNESS: On the point, Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the minister that we sold pork for a number of years here, and we charged one price in Canada and an entirely different, a lower price by the way for the pork we exported out of Canada, and we believe that principle is sound. The minister may differ, and that is quite understandable, but nevertheless we stand on that principle that we believe our wheat sold in our own domestic market should bear a proper relationship to the goods and services within our own Canadian economy. We are not asking something for nothing, but a price that bears a proper relationship to the rest of the economy of the country.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: You ask that we charge the people of Canada a higher price than we charge the people of Japan, or Germany or Egypt. That is what you are advocating.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, it could be a higher price and quite conceivably it could be a lower price.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: In the meantime we will make it the same price.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one word in respect to what Mr. Howe has just stated. He stated that it will never be government policy to bonus the wheat farmers of western Canada.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I did not say that. We have arranged a bonus to the western farmers whenever they have needed a bonus. But I say we will not tax the consumers of Canada by asking them to pay a price for their wheat that is higher than the price at which we sell the same wheat to consumers in other countries.

Mr. WRIGHT: The farmers of western Canada are paying a bonus to the eastern manufacturers through the tariffs that they are paying on the goods they are using for their wheat production. We should be prepared to play fair with both people. We have to sell our wheat in a world market and we have to buy the things to produce that wheat in a protected market.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: How much protection is there on agricultural implements?

Mr. WRIGHT: It is not only agricultural implements that enter into the production of wheat, there are other things.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Mr. Phelps has given you his view and I have given you mine. Now let's get on with the next item.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions with regard to grain marketing?

Negotiations for New International Wheat Agreement

The operation of the present International Wheat Agreement is referred to in the annual report of the Canadian Wheat Board. Although the farmers have been on the losing end of this agreement, we have not suggested nor do we now, that we should not complete our part of the bargain. We believe that in the light of experience of two wheat agreements in operation, we should have learned ways and means where it is possible to improve the protection offered the producer.

If a new International Wheat Agreement is to be successfully negotiated, we believe the producers' interests must be more adequately protected, both by substantial increases in floor and ceiling prices as well as an annual review of these prices, in order that they may be adjusted either up or down to meet general changes in conditions with regard to the cost of production.

We appreciate the government's offer to invite a representative of the three prairie farm unions to attend these negotiations, and we shall strive to effect a new agreement with these safeguards. However, we cannot agree to adopt the attitude of some that we must have a new agreement "at any price."

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Now, who are the "some" you refer to there? That is rather important, you know. Who are the ones who are wanting an agreement at any price?

• The WITNESS: We are not necessarily referring here to the negotiators of the agreement, sir. We have people in the prairie provinces today, individuals who hold these opinions. Some of them have expressed them privately and some have expressed them publicly, and they may be right on this. I am not going to argue. The prairie farm unions do not agree with that approach that we must have an agreement at any price. We do not think we should approach it with that idea in mind whatever, and we are supported in that stand certainly by the American delegation to that conference.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Phelps—

Mr. ARGUE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

Mr. ARGUE: We had agreed to take, as I understand it, this brief section by section and at the end of the section we were to ask questions. It does not matter to me if we are going to be asking questions at the end of every line, but I think that it should be clear and we should all be in the same position.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I stand corrected.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Phelps, have you reference to any of those bodies or organizations who are representing us in London, or have been, as those who were negotiating a wheat agreement at any price?

The WITNESS: No, sir, we did not have that in mind when drafting this brief. We had farmers who held those views and we were referring to those.

Nor do we agree that if we cannot get a new agreement which we can honourably accept, that we then have no alternative other than to go back to speculative marketing which long ago proved unsatisfactory.

We have a Wheat Board with considerable experience and training and we have confidence that in the event no agreement is operating, the Canadian Wheat Board can, with some additions, do a good job of merchandising western wheat in a businesslike and orderly manner. As previously stated we prefer a wheat agreement, provided prices and terms are reasonably acceptable.

Judging by the attitude of some importing countries regarding any new International Wheat Agreement, the prices and other concessions they require are beyond that which western Canadian farmers are in position to meet. We say this as a result of our experiences during the last two wheat agreements in view of attitudes expressed at the recent conference of producer and consumer representatives.

In the event there might not be a new International Wheat Agreement, we would again recommend that the Committee, the Standing Committee on Agriculture of the House of Commons that we now have the privilege of addressing, urge the Canadian Government to increase to maximum the membership of the Canadian Wheat Board. This we advocate so that, in the eventuality a new agreement is not reached, the Canadian Wheat Board could readily assume responsibility for all grain sales, as agents of the producing farmers. Two additional appointments to the Canadian Wheat Board would be actual producing farmers having the approval and endorsement of the organized farm movement of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the British Columbia block.

In this connection we further urge that our Canadian Government be requested to approach the US-American authorities, and subsequently other exporting countries, with a view to surveying the possibilities of securing an initial agreement between the wheat exporting countries for the orderly and equitable marketing of all producers' grain in a proper and businesslike manner at prices fair and equitable to producers and consumers.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions in connection with this paragraph?

Mr. GEORGE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness what he feels is the cost of production of a bushel of wheat, what the cost of production actually is.

Mr. ARGUE: The price of wheat.

The WITNESS: A fair relative price at the present time has been worked out, that is a price that would bear a fair relationship to the farmer's production costs, at approximately \$2.15 per bushel at the present time, in our own Canadian economy.

Mr. GEORGE: What is the actual figure in relation only to the farmer's work?

The WITNESS: I think you have it there. Now, you might point to certain individuals that can produce wheat cheaper than others. That depends on the size of their unit, it depends on their locality. There are so many unknown

factors that all you can do is to take an average, not only of farmers but areas, and that has been worked out by those who have made a study of economics, and I might say that by people who are employed by the farmers themselves as a fair price and a price that reflects a proper relationship.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Phelps, you say here you would like two additional appointments to the Canadian Wheat Board who would be actual producing farmers having the approval and endorsement of the organized farm movement of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the British Columbia block. Would you be satisfied if the appointment of actual producing farmers with your endorsement, would you be satisfied that if appointed they would then be responsible to the government in the same way as the present members of the Canadian Wheat Board are, or would you want some continuing control over their actions on that board?

The WITNESS: Well, ordinarily, if the government were paying their salaries, sir, then I think it goes without saying that we would not be in a good arguing position in asking further control, but in this case I question—I am not going to be too dogmatic about it, but inasmuch as the farmers are supplying the money here, are paying all salaries, then I think it is not asking too much that various farm organizations, not only farmers' unions in the organized farm movement—exercise more control, and I do not think it is asking too much under existing circumstances. If the government was assuming the complete responsibility, financial and otherwise, I think that is another thing, and I think farmers would have to forego something. I do not think we would make that appointment conditional upon that, but I think we would be within our rights in negotiating that matter further.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question as to whether salaries of the present Wheat Board are paid out of the proceeds of the sale of the farmers' wheat, or are paid separately by the government.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I rather think they are paid separately by the government.

Mr. STUDER: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in his statement that we cannot agree to adopt the attitude of some, that we must have an agreement at any price. Who is going to decide what that any price is going to be? That is, before a new agreement is negotiated this situation remains open here. As to whether it shall be expanded, who is going to decide what that price should be, at one price or at some other price? Who is going to make that decision?

The WITNESS: I think in our discussions with the minister when we were down here the last trip—and I always like to agree with the minister whenever I can—he made a statement that I was very pleased to hear made and which I agree with one hundred per cent, and he said that they were asking representative farm groups to go over to the wheat conference and they would wait their recommendations, and that when they were happy he would be happy, and if they were not happy he would not be happy, and I think that is a fair arrangement, as far as I am concerned; and we have assumed our share of responsibility as an organization on that basis and we shall advise to the best of our ability having the things that we have mentioned here in mind.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: And having advised I suppose you support the decision that will be based on that advice.

The WITNESS: We do not know, sir, we can only do our best.

Mr. WRIGHT: We just dealt with the Canadian Wheat Board, and one of the things on Exhibit XI is the board members, officers and staff, and their salaries, which come to \$1,608,730.67. Are those paid by the board?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I would have to check that. I was under the impression that we pay those salaries by order in council, but I am told now that they are paid from the growers' pool.

Mr. ARGUE: I think the producer pays them.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Phelps, you say here, "in the event no agreement is operating the Canadian Wheat Board can, with some additions do a good job of merchandising western wheat in a businesslike and orderly manner". Just what do you mean by, "with some additions"?

The WITNESS: What we are suggesting here—is that the Wheat Board are organized to do a certain job; then, recently, you asked them to assume responsibilities by taking on the responsibility of marketing coarse grains, that is oats and barley. And we believe that before we ask them to take on the responsibility for an additional amount over and above what they are doing now that it would be only fair to the board to take advantage of the legislation that was provided for them to increase their numbers, particularly to increase their numbers if the Wheat Board were asked to assume additional responsibility.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Correction. Members of the Wheat Board are paid from the proceeds of the wheat.

Mr. STUDER: In the event that you decide that you do not care to sell wheat in the international wheat market at any price, either at the listed or the unlisted price, and you find that the price is not a satisfactory one, then the alternative you propose is that in that eventuality under the wheat agreement the Canadian Wheat Board would assume responsibility for all grain sales and relieve the producers completely of any share of responsibility. As a result of that alternative, if it does not materialize into as high a price as we get under this international agreement, who is going to assume that responsibility?

The WITNESS: The farmers will have to take that responsibility, sir; you can't have it both ways. If we decide to accept the new agreement then we will have to assume some responsibility and take a chance on it. There is no doubt about that. What we are asking for here is right in the brief, and if that condition comes about, and we are taking that over by the Wheat Board then the present marketing price system should be amended to include the floor price machinery for cereal grains we are asking for.

Mr. STUDER: I do not see how the government would have that responsibility. It would appear here to put it in the position of having the government assume it. I can see that that responsibility should be accepted by the farmers if they were handling their own wheat under a farmers' organization, selling wheat for them in the way we have been discussing; or it would come under the Agricultural Prices Support Act. I think you would have to assume some responsibility for the alternative here. I cannot see why the farmers should not accept their share of responsibility in the matter because of the fact that it would be their responsibility because they are taking it over from the Wheat Board.

The WITNESS: I think maybe we are paying the government a compliment in this case when we say we have confidence in them and the board and that they would do a good job. But I want to point this out, what guarantee does the government now give the farmer except to guarantee the initial price. The answer is, none; the farmer today takes practically all the risk there is.

Mr. STUDER: If they want to attempt to deal with their own grain they will have to assume their share of responsibility also. This may sound political, but it was political in the Gravelbourg by-election last year because I have in my files a circular put out during the by-election stating that the people should vote against the "wheat steal," leaving the impression among the people that the government was stealing the farmers' wheat.

The WITNESS: That would definitely not be issued by the farmer unions.

Mr. STUDER: I would think it would be the farmers unions, and that is why I do not think the government should accept the responsibility of the alternative; I think the farmers should accept that if there is going to be an alternative.

The WITNESS: As I say, I think it may be their job—we can interpret it as that. We think they would do a good job. We have confidence in the Wheat Board to do that. We will discuss that with the board. And now as this condition arises we would have to be prepared to do our part, and we would be prepared to assume our responsibility under those circumstances. We are asking for only one protection that comes later on in the brief—we are asking that either the Wheat Board Act or the Agricultural Prices Support Act should be amended in the manner that I indicated. Then you would be prepared to take some responsibility as I see it.

Mr. STUDER: What objection would there be to have this carried out under the Marketing Act—

The WITNESS: As far as I am personally concerned—and I am speaking personally only—but so far as I am personally concerned the answer is, none. I am speaking for myself only. I cannot speak for the farmers' unions on the question that you ask. I do not know that as a general policy the organized farm movement is coming more and more into the idea of accepting the principle of a producers' marketing board. Now, whether that is accepted now or in the future to the point where they will be prepared to back the whole thing including cereal grain, I am not prepared to say; but in general principle they are in favour of that principle as it applies to other agricultural commodities. They have stated that here in this brief. We might have been able to tie in eggs but not meat products, particularly in view of the present chaotic condition of the market.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Let us keep on and read that part of the brief further.

The WITNESS: Yes, Mr. Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on the international wheat agreement?

Grain overages.

The WITNESS: I would just like to make one comment before starting my discussion on this last paragraph. We attach a great deal of significance and importance to that last paragraph; and the three farm unions are working on that now with a view to doing what little we can.

And on that point I think that we have several witnesses.

Grain Overages

A sore point with western farmers is the question of the continually recurring situation of grain overages. The sessional paper No. 182, filed in the House of Commons, May, 1951, showed that 9,982,016 bushels net overages of grain were reported. It is true that this covered, in the case of a few companies, even a longer period than the five-year pool, and although some may argue that this, on a percentage basis, only represents a small percentage, we nevertheless submit that this is a very large amount of grain and represents a substantial amount of money that has accumulated as a result of short-weighting the farmers. Again we find this year, in sessional paper No. 124A, April 2, 1952, that very substantial net grain overages have occurred during the past crop-year. These cover country elevator operations only, but do not cover terminal elevator operations.

We do not suggest it is always possible to weigh large amounts of grain and come out with exact balance. On this point we have two main objections. First, we think it is entirely contrary to the spirit of the Canada Grain Act, to permit elevator companies to absorb these substantial grain overages as company profits. Secondly, we object to any individual or company which seeks to justify these overages as an offset against the legalized shrinkage allowance. We would point out that we do not object to the maintenance of an equitable shrinkage allowance to take care of whatever actual invisible loss results from the handling of grain, but once having justified by regulation a recognized shrinkage allowance, it would be completely erroneous to permit it as an offset against overages, as, unless the shrinkage actually takes place, then its continuance cannot be justified. On the other hand, if the present shrinkage allowance can be justified and grain does in handling shrink $\frac{3}{4}$ of one per cent, with a higher rate for some other classifications, then of course such shrinkage or loss should and must actually disappear or evaporate, and must at no time be confused with, or used as an offset against, any overage at any time.

We note in connection with these overages that substantial amounts accrue at both country and terminal elevators, and that these overages accumulated both on a net and gross basis. It is interesting to note that a much larger amount accumulated on a net basis, which we are informed is calculated on the basis of the wheat after it is cleaned. This might further serve to indicate that farmers are being penalized by a rate of dockage somewhat in excess of the amount of material actually cleaned out of the grain.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: On that point I think we have several witnesses who want to be heard on this subject. I suggest that we accept this for the moment and have it before us when we discuss that subject later on. I think that if we are launching into a discussion of overages that there are other witnesses here who would like to be heard.

Mr. ARGUE: Then could Mr. Phelps later on have an opportunity to answer the argument of these other witnesses or to question them?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I do not know why not if he keeps to that one question. I think we must take up the subject of overages because it has been discussed in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well then, we will take the next one.

The WITNESS: Yes, requesting grading statistics.

Request Grading Statistics

As representatives of the farmers we want to know how much of the various grades of grain were purchased as tough and how much was purchased as damp. Our request requires that each grade be listed separately;—

I might say in addition to damp I meant all grades whether it is damp or what it is.

—and then follow through to reveal how much of this grain was actually sold as damp or tough, and how much or what percentage of it was mixed with dry grain, or to use the elevator terminology, “naturally dried.” We suspect that of the very large amount of grain purchased as tough and damp from farmers, a small percentage of that total was actually artificially dried, so that the amount mixed or so-called “naturally dried” must have been quite substantial. This process, of course, is a straight gain for the elevator companies as in their purchases from the farmers for this class of grain, farmers were penalized at time of delivery. That is the farmer suffered a straight reduction in price, even though the grain may have in some cases been only a fraction-of-one-per cent in excess moisture content.

We submit that a strict interpretation of section 138, sub-section 2, would regard much of this grain which is so-called "naturally dried" as a grade gain and the excess or gain would, or should be, subject to confiscation along with other grade gains or upgrading under this section.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Well, Mr. Phelps we already have evidence on overages taken today from the Wheat Board and I for one think—and perhaps the committee are of the same opinion—that we will have to discuss this subject with the Board of Grain Commissioners. I do not know if it is the wish of the committee but I am going to suggest that we defer our discussion on that for the moment.

Mr. ROSS: I want to ask a question on that. Grain delivered to the elevator is grain delivered on account of the Wheat Board.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is right.

Mr. ROSS: And it applies against the account of the Wheat Board, not the elevator.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is right.

Mr. ROSS: I think there ought to be some explaining done there then.

The WITNESS: On this point I don't want to interject a new angle. You say that it becomes the property of the Wheat Board. Now I understand that question has been brought up here before. The Wheat Board as I understand it—in fact the minister has stated that the Wheat Board at no time buys any wheat from the farmers, they merely act as the agent for the farmers, or as the trustee.

Mr. ROSS: But the elevator companies, both the elevator companies and the other line companies, act as agents for the Canadian Wheat Board, and the wheat is delivered to the elevators and then title passes from the producer to the Canadian Wheat Board.

The WITNESS: As the agent for the farmer.

Mr. ROSS: Title is lost sight of at the time it is delivered to the elevator. The minister says so and I think that is true.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The Wheat Board markets the grain for the farmers. Title to the wheat when it is delivered to the elevator passes to the Wheat Board.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we go on to the next, for improved records?

For Improved Records

Another important point which has, or could have, a bearing on the question of overages, is also tied in with this question of processing and handling tough and damp grain. This grain is weighed in at country elevators, irrespective of percentage of excess moisture. The extra moisture is not deducted from the weight on the country elevator receipt slips, but the farmer suffers a deduction, not by weight, but by being penalized through receiving a lower price per bushel. The elevator companies in turn sell that portion of the grain which is so-called "naturally dried," or in simpler terms is simply mixed with dried grain. It is subsequently sold as straight grain including the extra moisture content for which a deduction has been made to the farmer. It is true that in the case of grain that is artificially dried, the warehouse certificates are adjusted, but this in turn only covers the terminal operation and apparently does not extend back to any corrections being made in the receiving slips at the local elevator points. It seems to us that in order to get a true and complete picture with reference to the overage question, a more complete system of records should be kept than appears to exist at the present time. In years like the last two crop seasons, if we are to assess the total grain handlings right from country elevators to the discharge of the grain at the terminals, in actual

practice there should be a very substantial shortage—at least to the extent of the amount of excess moisture that is driven out of the grain by artificial drying. Unless accurate records are kept, it provides opportunity for the elevator company to off-set an actual overage when grain has been “naturally dried,” against a book or paper shortage which results through the drying process.

I think there is agreement on it. That is the comment in here. It is not the warehouse certificate at the terminal point; that is no good unless you go right back, you have to go clear back and then work it out by comparison and see how it balances. In our opinion I think that can be proven.

Again on this question of artificial drying we had learned by our inspection of the terminal elevator operation, later verified by correspondence with the Board of Grain Commissioners, that grain artificially dried is not put over the scales as a usual practice after it is dried, although it is weighed before being put in the driers. Its weight is simply calculated or estimated according to formula. Then the warehouse certificates are adjusted accordingly and on the basis of the formula. We believe that this is another question that should be investigated by a Royal Commission, as we do not see any good and justifiable reason why this grain should not be put over the scales and its weight be accurately determined (and the records adjusted accordingly) after the artificial drying process.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: There is going to be some discussion of this subject. That will come up when we have the Board of Grain Commissioners before us.

The CHAIRMAN: Canada Grain Act circumvented.

Canada Grain Act circumvented

The question of mixing grain at both local and terminal elevators was a subject of a very exhaustive study by a former committee on grain handling. The present Canada Grain Act was, we believe, drafted with the idea in mind of reducing this practice to the minimum and thus preventing it from becoming an abuse. We have reason to believe that over the years certain practices have been permitted which have allowed more and more latitude, and that at least in some respects the intention of the present Canada Grain Act has been circumvented to some degree. As an instance of this, at one time terminal elevator companies were required by officers of the board to maintain a proper system of bin records which, we presume, would have clearly indicated location of different grades of grain in each bin at all times, and as a result grain could be followed through and proper records kept on its movement until it was actually loaded on the boat. We understand, as a result of correspondence with the Board of Grain Commissioners, that at one time records were maintained indicating the different bins from which the grain was drawn for each boat shipment. Apparently these are both procedures which have been discontinued.

At the present time we understand the practice is to draw on occasion from more than one bin; in fact at times from several bins, and sometimes different grades being mixed while it is being loaded into the boats. We would suggest that a very close study be made to see whether or not more protection would be afforded by re-adopting the former system of the maintenance of proper bin records together with reports of the bins from which the samples were drawn at time of loading.

According to first-hand information received at Fort William recently, we were informed that during the early operations of the Canada Grain Act fairly accurate records were maintained continuously regarding the grade receipts and outturn from the country elevators through and including the terminals, but we were informed that during later years the maintenance of these records and information has been discontinued. We believe the Royal Commission should, when appointed, study this situation closely. Present records which are being

maintained do not at all times appear to provide a complete and detailed inventory at stated intervals. Therefore it would seem in the best interests of the producers that a system of recording which would make this information available and thus maintain a continuous check, should be reinstated.

Grain handling and grading

The question of grain handling at local elevators has been, and continues to be, a troublesome one in many parts of the prairies. It is only fair to say that we are not laying all the blame on the Government Inspection Department, nor do we believe that the methods of all elevator agents or grain companies are necessarily at all times questionable. We do continue, however, to receive reports regarding individual elevators at which many of our farmers feel they are being discriminated against in the matter of grades. Frequently, lack of storage space is used as a means of forcing the farmer to take a lower grade than admittedly he otherwise would.

We believe that one of the remedies for this very unsatisfactory situation is to insist on a more practical and equitable delivery quota.

We also believe a practice has developed upon which farmers ought to be more constantly advised. When a difference develops between the agent and the farmer on grades, we find on numerous occasions the agent sends the sample in dispute to their own company inspector for grading (in a small brown envelope) instead of sending the regular two pound sample to the Inspection Department, Winnipeg, and when the grade is received the farmer assumes this is the grade given by the government grain inspector.

We would recommend that the Committee should instruct the Board of Grain Commissioners to considerably increase their educational work on this and other points of the Canada Grain Act for the protection of the farmers' interests.

We also believe the Board of Grain Commissioners should be requested to give more encouragement to farmers to demand subject-to-grade and dockage tickets in any case where there is disagreement on grades offered at the local elevator point.

If I might digress at this point a moment, a good many people today think in terms of conditions as they applied five or ten years ago. There were certain sections of the Grain Act which were applicable to meeting conditions then, but due to a shortage of space—for instance, there is not much use of talking today of the farmer sending a carload of grain to Fort William or Winnipeg, because there are few farmers today who can send a carload of grain like they used to do, because of the quota system and other factors. All in all, we have to change some of our procedures.

Elevator agents should, we feel, be encouraged by the Board to make more and wider use of this type of settlement, as we have several reports to the effect that many elevator agents are quite averse to issuing this type of ticket to a farmer and sometimes when a farmer insists, it has resulted in considerable unpleasantness. The Board of Grain Commissioners should see to it that all agents be instructed that as one of the conditions of their licence to operate they are expected, and required, to issue subject-to-grade and dockage tickets, whenever the farmer requests same and to do so without any ill will or hesitation knowing that the farmer is fully within his rights so to request.

We believe the majority of country elevator agents endeavour to do their work in a fair and efficient manner.

Changes in method of grain grading

As a result of the large number of complaints that have been received from farmers in various points of the three prairie provinces, we would strongly recommend that a further and very close study be made of the

inclusion in our present grain grading regulations, of a provision for optional grading of stated quantities of wheat by milling and baking tests upon the request of the producer. Also, that a review be made of the present procedure of price penalties on tough and damp grain, to see if there is some other formula which would be more equitable to the producer than is the present procedure. We believe it is hardly fair that the producer who has grain with a moisture content just slightly in excess of the amount permitted, should automatically be penalized to the maximum amount. We therefore recommend that the new formula should provide for a reduction in price more closely related to the actual excess moisture content in the grain itself.

Mr. ARGUE: May I ask a question at this point? What reply have you been given when you ask that a milling and baking test be made as a basis of grading grain? You have advanced that idea before? What reception was it given?

The WITNESS: Well, I would think gradually a little more favourable reception. There is still a difference of opinion at the administrative level, but those people will speak for themselves, I presume, before this committee, but I think it is safe to say that there are those in administrative positions today who feel that some practical plan could be worked out. Now, it is like everything else, it may have to proceed on a trial and error basis, and maybe it could not be a blanket thing all over the country to start with. It may have to be applied on a regional basis, but my hope is that it won't be too long before a move will be made in this direction.

Mr. ARGUE: Have you given any thought to the inclusion in grading of a protein factory?

The WITNESS: Well, milling and baking tests take protein into account as one of the factors—not the only one. Protein has been discussed as being a measuring stick. Those are things we would be prepared to discuss further in detail with the committee, but we think we have presented it to the Board of Grain Commissioners on other occasions, and this is something, as you know, that the organized farm movement in the west has been after for a good many years.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you had requests of this kind from the park areas, the northern areas and the bush areas, Mr. Phelps?

The WITNESS: Well, I would say the three farm unions do not presume to represent all the farmers but a fair cross-section—and at the convention last fall, where this matter was discussed, there was no objection from the park areas that I heard.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Would you like to have the system of grading used in the States?—

A. It is mentioned right here. We are making no definite recommendations.

Q. They have a protein system, haven't they?—A. That is only one of the yardsticks that they use, as I understand it, for determining the value of their grain.

Q. Have we not a better system? Our system is considered all over the world as the best.—A. It is considered to be superior, sir. We mention that in the next paragraph, but we wonder if the producer is not being asked to bear a disproportionate share of the load in maintaining these standards of quality.

U.S.A. Grading System

A number of farmers have again indicated a desire to have wheat graded by weight similar to the plan followed in the U.S.A. While we are not prepared to make a definite recommendation on this point, we would urge that the matter be again reviewed. We realize that the Canadian grades of wheat enjoy a very good reputation in world markets, and that usually milling grades

are of a high quality. We do believe, however, that a fairly close check ought to be made to ensure that the actual producer is not bearing the brunt, or being required to assume a disproportionate share of the responsibility in maintaining this reputation for a high quality product.

Mr. HETLAND: You just mentioned weight for purposes of grading. The United States grades on protein as well as weight?

The WITNESS: I think your point is well taken.

Mr. STUDER: In connection with that protein content of wheat. In Manitoba a farmer who has 16½ per cent protein content gets about 47 cents a bushel more than its weight on as little protein content, and I think that is a big factor in relation to the disparity with regard to what the producers are receiving and the actual value of the wheat he is producing.

The WITNESS: Mr. Studer brings an important point to the attention of this committee. Do not forget that a lot of Saskatchewan wheat is being handled on the protein basis today, that is in areas accessible to some of our main mills. They send trucks out to these areas and they skim off the cream of the crop; they did that in the Humboldt area last year because there was wheat there with a high protein content in it. That was the first time that happened in that area. Usually it happens in other districts.

The CHAIRMAN: On this matter of diversion charges, we heard a good deal of evidence today, and I think we could consider this as read.

The WITNESS: Yes, if you wish it that way.

Mr. ARGUE: Will it be printed in the record?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: I hope you will read our views on this section at your leisure.

Diversion Charges

Payment to grain companies of diversion charges on the various kinds of grain shipped through Port Churchill or Prince Rupert, as well as that diverted to interior government terminal elevators, and interior mills, has been a very questionable practice since its inception. This practice has reached the point where it can no longer be justified. More especially is it true in the case of grain diverted through Churchill, Prince Rupert and interior government elevators.

In the case of Churchill, costs of construction were paid for this modern terminal elevator from revenues derived from prairie sources. In the case of Prince Rupert together with the interior terminal elevators, the cost of construction was borne by the taxpayers of Canada as a whole, as a service and as a protection in maintaining reserves of basic food supplies.

Apparently at the time diversion charges were first authorized, the argument was advanced that it would take care of special bin grain that might be diverted at the farmer's specific instructions to some terminal elevator company other than the company which received it at the local elevator point. With changed conditions we question the validity of such an argument at this time, as in our opinion elevator companies are provided with, and are paid, a fair price for each and every separate service that is rendered. We do not recall any other business in Canada, save the terminal elevator companies, that is permitted to levy a charge for a service that it does not perform, or get paid for business it does not do. This type of special privilege has been particularly objectionable during the last few years, when terminal facilities were taxed to the maximum, and in many cases where they were already loaded to capacity. Payment of the diversion charges on any grain movements in the above category ordered by the Wheat Board, and those through Prince Rupert and Churchill are a straight deduction from the farmer's account.

Diversion charges paid by the farmers on grains going through Churchill last year alone amounted to \$139,560.91. This had the effect of offsetting to a large extent the savings that would otherwise be made by the farmer in transporting his grain over this shorter and cheaper route. We would strongly suggest that this Committee recommend that these diversion charges be discontinued at the end of this crop-year, and that before they are reinstituted even on a revised basis, that they be subject to a special enquiry along with the various other points we have suggested, and be referred to a Royal Commission herein recommended.

For Amendment to Canada Grain Act

The present Canada Grain Act was originally adopted in 1930. This Act largely resulted from a fairly thorough examination of grain trading practices in operation at that time. The Act was designed primarily not only to give a general operating formula for grain handling, but to eliminate certain abuses which became apparent during the examination. It was clearly indicated during the discussion which preceded the passing of this important Act, that many of the changes were designed to protect the farmer's interest. In addition to curbing some of the abuses at that time, the Act was designed to obviate abuses which might occur.

The practice of grain handling has, in many respects, inevitably altered during the long period that has intervened since this Act was originally drafted. Although there have been some further investigations with regard to grain handling in the interim, it would appear now that an up-to-date review, which would result in amendments, is required at this time—not only to revise the Act itself but also to reconsider the regulations which have from time-to-time been passed and amended.

Recommendations

We would make three definite recommendations for amendment to the Canada Grain Act.

We will start with these three, but we believe there are others.

First, that the overages accumulating in country elevator operations be treated in the same manner and subject to the same regulations as now are presumed to apply to the overages accumulating at terminals. Secondly, that the provision for adjustment as between overages and shortages be discontinued; and thirdly, that the Board of Grain Commissioners be required to strictly enforce the regulations on this question of overages in the matter of confiscations, and that the present Canada Grain Act be further amended to provide that such monies realized from the sale of confiscated overages in the future, instead of being paid into the Dominion Treasury, would be turned over to the Canadian Wheat Board for disbursement back to the farmers, to whom this money properly belongs.

The Canada Grain Act provides for confiscation of grain overages of two different types. The one that has been most commonly referred to in the past is covered in Section 138A. This has to do solely with overages in weight, or in other words surplus grain that cannot otherwise be legally accounted for.

There is another very important section covered in Section 138, Sub-Section 2. This has to do with overages in grades covering the transfer of grain from a lower to a higher grade in public terminal operations.

We have a considerable amount of correspondence on file which makes evident that we have sought for approximately a year and a half to obtain definite information concerning terminal elevator grade handlings. Copies of this correspondence will be readily made available to this Committee on request. Perusal of the correspondence, plus our personal observations during interviews with the Board of Grain Commissioners and the key administrative

staff, lead us to suspect that the methods that have been adopted and the changes made in keeping the records over the years may have resulted in rendering this important section almost ineffective.

For practical reasons as well as operating conditions, particularly at certain seasons, the annual weigh-over of these elevators does not normally coincide with the end of the crop-year.

When the weigh-overs do take place, there is some evidence to indicate insufficient precaution in closely checking and taking adequate samples from individual bins; and further, that samples are not preserved for a proper period of time, after completion of the weigh-over, for the purpose of re-checking.

We believe this committee should check this point very closely, as if these samples and records covering weigh-over reports are not properly preserved and provided for checking purposes later, we then fail to see how the Board of Grain Commissioners can effectively carry out their instructions under Section 138 of the Canada Grain Act.

We often hear the statement made, sometimes rather loosely we believe, that grain companies lose grades.

On the long-term average we have good reason to doubt this statement. One elevator company in particular has made a statement that it lost grades, but it is interesting to note that the comparisons are usually made as between the country elevator receiving points and the inspection department at Winnipeg. In order to get the true picture of grain handlings of this or any other nature, it would be necessary to have the complete picture, and follow this grain right through from the time it is delivered by the farmers to the country elevator up to and including the time it is loaded in the boat and disposed of under the certificate final.

In actual practice, we find that in purchasing the grain the elevator company, for its own protection, gets the maximum of the grade, whereas when the grain is sold it is mixed down to the absolute minimum. We believe that samples we have taken from boats actually being loaded will amply bear out this contention. In order to have a complete inventory and to be able to determine exactly what the position is for a given point, the farm unions have, for over a year, been trying to find out from the Board of Grain Commissioners the figures relating to the total handlings at the country elevator points by grades and condition as well as the total sales by these same companies on the certificates final and diversions to internal elevators or mills, plus a record of their inventory at the start of the same period as well as a complete inventory of weights and grades at the weigh-over. Again we say, on this point, we are far from satisfied with the results obtained by our enquiries. We would submit that on this important point, among others, a further study and investigation appears justified. We would suggest here that we believe this point, among many others, is one that should be investigated by a Royal Commission at a very early date. The commission should, in our opinion, enquire into various matters pertaining to grain grading, handling, storing, drying, mixing, et cetera. The entire situation became more complicated and confused, particularly during the last two years when there has been such a large percentage of tough and damp grain.

We believe that the review of the regulations and trade practices are equally as important as a review of the Act itself. We have enumerated several points under previous headings where we have indicated specific amendments should be made. It will no doubt be found upon further examination that more may be necessary.

Earlier tabling of the annual report to the Board of Grain Commissioners

We note by Section 23 of the Canada Grain Act that the Board of Grain Commissioners is required to file, with the Minister in charge, a report of their operations covering the previous crop-year, during the month of January each year.

We submit that this is another Section of the Act which should be amended immediately. The operation of the Board of Grain Commissioners is a very important one, not only to grain farmers, but its general supervision of one of the basic food supplies of Canada, and its handling of same is of major importance to the general public. A large sum of money is voted each year for its operation and the amount of money derived as revenue from the charges levied is also quite substantial. We submit in all seriousness that this Section should be amended to require the tabling of the annual report covering the operations of this Board in Parliament in order that the members and other interested citizens, including representatives of farm organizations, may have access to this report in the same manner as the Canadian Wheat Board and other important commissions are required to file their reports in the House of Commons.

We are convinced it is insufficient that the Minister be the only one to receive such important information, unless he is obligated to table same in the House of Commons by a definite date in a manner comparable to that of other important reports.

We would also submit that while these reports have been made available in the past, they are usually very late in being published. We believe that in view of the fact that the crop-year closes on July 31st of each year, and allowing reasonable time for the various companies to complete their returns, this report should be made available earlier to all interested parties, committees and elected members of parliament in order to provide up-to-date information for the agricultural committee and other important discussions that take place in the House of Commons.

MR. FERRIE: What benefit would this recommendation be to the primary producer? In the first section it might be of benefit to the farmer, the producer, but here in the second section what would it do? It could do him harm.

THE WITNESS: I do not see where it does any harm to have it published.

MR. FERRIE: You are giving information up to date as to the grain the farmer has in his possession, and if you give the dealers all that information then you are going to do the farmer some harm the way that second portion of it works out.

THE WITNESS: The same argument could be advanced by the Wheat Board, but it is not. I listened to their report this afternoon; and in a moment we are going to commend them for their report, for the manner in which it is prepared and for the material it contains. We are going to make certain recommendations too. Then, as to the Board of Grain Commissioners, we know that they are a regulatory body, but their report does not come out as soon as that of the Wheat Board.

Right Hon. MR. HOWE: I might explain that the report of the wheat board and the report of the grain commissioners are delivered to the minister about the same time, but the Wheat Board are in a position to get their report printed much more expeditiously than was the case with the Board of Grain Commissioners, because the Board of Grain Commissioners cannot obtain the fast service that the Wheat Board have available to them. The Board of Grain Commissioners being a civil service organization must get their printing done through the Queen's printer and sometimes takes quite a few weeks to get printing done by the procedure.

Mr. Ross: But is it not the practice that Parliament pays the Wheat Board sufficient for them to get their report printed?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: There is a little more red tape in publishing the report of the Board of Grain Commissioners; but we get their report about the same time as we get the report of the Wheat Board.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on that point? If not, we will go ahead.

Appointment of a Royal Commission on Grain

We would urge in addition to the specific recommendations we are making in other sections of this brief, that a Royal Commission include a thorough study of the whole question of grain handling, storing, transportation, drying, over-ages, weighing, mixing, grading and selling, and all other relative matters pertaining to the handling of grain with particular reference to the protection of the interests of the actual producer, including the necessary amendments to the Act itself, as well as a complete review of the regulations and amendments thereto. We were interested to note in this connection that during one of our early interviews with the Board of Grain Commissioners, the chairman himself volunteered the information that the present Act had stood for quite a long period and that it was quite possible that a revision may now be due.

Producer Representation on Board of Grain Commissioners

It is the opinion of the prairie farm unions that the interests of western farmers would be better served if the Board of Grain Commissioners was re-organized to include representation of actual producing farmers at the policy level. Furthermore, we object to depriving the Board of important personnel to carry the responsibilities of another office. We refer particularly to the case of Mr. Roy Milner, who has been appointed transport controller, and whose place was not filled on the Board. It does not seem fair to expect this important Board to operate short-handed at a time when its responsibilities are greater than ever before.

We would suggest that the number of members on the Board of Grain Commissioners be increased and that the additional appointees be practical farmers and that the Board be more definitely instructed regarding its duties of administration of the Canada Grain Act and in the protection of the farmer's interest.

Transportation of Grain

The prairie farm unions would urge this Committee to recommend to the Government that the office of Transport Controller be made a permanent one.

The present bottle-neck in shipping both by lake and rail, and the resultant congestion has been gradually developing for some considerable period of time. This has been brought about by a number of factors, not the least of which have been:—

The WITNESS: On (1) I might say here, Mr. Chairman, I do submit to this committee for their immediate consideration that we as a group consider it unwise in view of the present transportation situation—that instead of improving, the possibilities are that it is going to get worse, and it is going to continue to require special attention—

—(1) generally changed conditions; (2) a shortage of railway rolling stock, and at times lake and ocean vessels; (3) the expansion and industrial development of other parts of Canada with the resultant increasing claims on transportation facilities for a variety of uses, including military purposes, which disrupt, and sometimes result in serious transportation bottle-necks concerning basic food supplies. We would urge the Committee to investigate shipping

conditions on the Great Lakes, and to ascertain whether or not some form of bonus system would encourage a more adequate supply of lake boats for grain hauling purposes. We have been assured by qualified individuals that lake boat owners would prefer to handle grain rather than ore, and other industrial materials. They also point out that they cannot always do so, as non-grain shipments are more profitable at the present time. We would also suggest that the Committee investigate the possibility of a more positive program of lake boat construction if present equipment is found inadequate.

In discussing this question with certain agencies interested in lake shipping, they bring up another interesting point in relation to the proposed deepening of the St. Lawrence water route. They claim, and it would appear with some justification, that if and when this route is deepened, it will automatically displace a large number of lake boats, and that parties who might be interested are hesitant to invest too heavily in the construction of new equipment in the event that it might soon be displaced by ocean-going ships. Until this major decision is made, if it is found upon investigation that there is, or will be, an acute shortage of lake boats, then steps should be taken either to lease suitable boats in the interim to assist in grain transportation on the Great Lakes, or as an alternative, ease the restrictions on ships of foreign registration suitable for this work, and permit them to both load and discharge their cargo at Canadian ports. It would be necessary, no doubt, to take this latter point up with the Maritime Shipping Commission, under whose jurisdiction we understand lake transportation mainly operates.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, since this was written there has been considerable change in the picture; it is changing constantly, moving back and forth.

Mr. ARGUE: I move that we adjourn.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: We are getting on now, toward the end of the session. The rest of the brief might be taken as read and printed in the record and perhaps Mr. Phelps could summarize the rest of it for us. I know he must be tired by now; I know what that feels like. Would you just summarize? Would that be all right?

The WITNESS:

Farmer Representation on Maritime Shipping Commission

While on the question of the Maritime Shipping Commission, due to its close relationship in some respects with the grain shipping question, we would urge that a western farmer be added to this important transportation commission. In view of the fact that transportation is a key problem for prairie grain and livestock producers, and that railway rolling stock is being taxed to capacity, we would suggest that in the interest of general economy and as a direct saving to farmers, every encouragement be given to the maximum use of the much shorter route of Churchill, whenever and wherever possible, as we feel that this would release additional rolling stock, due to the fact that the rail trip to the seaboard could be made in shorter time, and at reduced expense.

Farm Storage

Another important problem affecting western grain producers is storage congestion at local and terminal elevator points. It is our opinion that a plan of farm storage should be inaugurated so as to compensate farmers for the grain they have stored on their farms and encourage them to construct adequate storage facilities. We believe this should be so designed that the Canadian Wheat Board could discontinue storage payments on any particular grade of grain they wish to have marketed at any stated date. US-American farmers already enjoy the benefits of such a policy and we understand that the method has considerably eased their former congested storage facilities and tends to

supply a more uniform flow of grain throughout the year. By thus feeding the market more evenly it should assist in relieving some of the pressure on our transportation system, especially during the peak delivery season.

Delivery Quotas

We realize that the past two crop-years have presented considerable difficulty, but we also feel that had the Wheat Board been assisted, in drafting quota policies, by actual producers who were conversant with the problems of the movement at the point of delivery, at least some of the inconveniences and injustices could have been avoided.

Concerning delivery quotas we believe that some further consideration should be given the smaller farmers, as we feel the present straight acreage quota tends to give the large farmer certain advantages.

We submit that it was a serious error on the part of the Wheat Board to lift all quotas as was done last fall. We suggest, that in the future whenever storage space is at a premium the quota should be established at or near the point where farmers have opportunity to deliver their fair share of grain. We further believe that these quotas should be strictly adhered to and that a free choice in delivery points should be provided. It is our contention that much of the congestion in country elevators has been caused by quotas being set without regard to the available storage facilities, plus the lack of much closer supervision and co-ordination regarding a more even and proper distribution of available box-cars.

Unclaimed Moneys in the Wheat Board Account

The prairie farm unions have, on previous occasions, called to the attention of the Government the fact that there is an account of several million dollars unclaimed money in the Canadian Wheat Board, awaiting distribution. We would urge the Committee to consider recommending that a large part of this money should be set aside as a capital fund from which the interest would annually be made available for organizational and educational purposes of the organized farm movement in the prairie provinces. We suggest the money so made available could be distributed on a basis of the amount of wheat delivered from each province during the contract period. This would constitute an arrangement similar to the plan followed by the Wheat Board after World War 1, when funds were made available for farm organization work in the Province of Manitoba.

Feedbanks

Notwithstanding certain statements that have been made to the contrary, it is our opinion that the establishment of feedbanks in Eastern Canada and in British Columbia, would be a long term advantage to western farmers. It would be necessary, of course, to have certain provisions made in order to safeguard the price structure for the western producer. We believe eastern feeders, and those at the west coast, should be able to buy their feed directly from the Canadian Wheat Board, without the necessity of dealing with commission agents and brokerage firms as at present. We feel that purchases direct from the Wheat Board in carload lots by eastern or west coast feeders, would mean a saving in price to them, plus better quality feed, while at the same time safeguarding this important market for prairie farmers.

Producer Representation on Wheat Board

In view of the fact that the Wheat Board Act has already been amended to provide for additional representation, and that two vacancies now exist on the Wheat Board, we urge that the Government immediately appoint two producing farmers to fill these vacancies. We would request the support of this

Committee in making such a recommendation to the Minister at once. This action would become yet more urgent in the event a new International Wheat Agreement is not implemented. Failure to arrive at a new agreement would result in throwing a substantially heavier load upon the Board.

We believe the present members are working at or near capacity, and the time has now arrived to start to train additional personnel representing producers and at the policy level.

Canadian Wheat Board Report

We congratulate the Wheat Board for making its annual report available in record time, and while we particularly commend the program of systematic and orderly marketing of a large volume of low grade wheat in such a manner as not to seriously affect the market for our coarse grains, we do nevertheless question certain points in the annual report.

The first we question is recorded on page 2 of the report. We question the advisability of our Canadian delegates on the wheat council agreeing to further concessions with regard to our present agreement, having in mind the very low price which governs. We are not objecting to the fulfilment of present commitments, even if prices previously agreed to are low; but we certainly question increasing the amounts unless there is a definite or implied obligation to do so.

On another point (on page 11 of the report) we note that a large volume of the wheat sold outside the Agreement last year as class 2 wheat was sold according to the report at the same price levels as that which was charged or received for wheat sold under the Agreement. It would appear to us, having in mind that class 2 wheat for nearly all grades ranged considerably higher than International Wheat Agreement prices, that the Board might have been well advised to increase its price for these lower grades more in line with class 2 prices at the time of sales.

The Voluntary Requisition

At this time we wish to bring to your attention the request of the prairie farm unions with respect to the voluntary requisition system for the payment of farm union dues. It is evident that all moneys in the Wheat Board treasury belong to the farmers. This has been admitted on previous occasions when government officials have stated that the Board does not buy grain but only handles it as an agent of the farmer. Therefore, we assume that the farmer should be privileged to issue a requisition against his own account in the Wheat Board, for the payment of his annual union dues.

We appreciate the fact that the Minister, Mr. Howe, has suggested that this would be a proper amendment to the Wheat Board Act to be introduced as a private member's bill. We are hopeful arrangements can be completed to have this bill introduced in the House of Commons at an early date, and we would take this opportunity to solicit the active support of the members of this Committee.

We are aware of the fact that there would be certain additional expense involved in the operation of this plan, and the unions offer, as they have previously, to reimburse the Wheat Board for any additional expense.

We would ask this Committee to investigate our request in this regard, and to consider recommending that the proposed voluntary requisition method be established at an early date.

Division of Authority

The prairie farm unions would direct to the attention of this Committee the matter of division of authority affecting federal agricultural administration in the Government of Canada. For instance, certain phases of agricultural policy come within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture. Other important

phases of government policy on agriculture, such as Board of Grain Commissioners, Wheat Board, et cetera, come under the authority of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. We believe that this division of authority does not lend itself to administrative efficiency, nor does it always operate in the interests of the primary producer. It is not our intention to loosely criticize any one member of the cabinet, nor to attempt to compare qualifications of the various ministers concerned. We do feel, however, that the entire matter of government was with respect to agriculture would be more clear cut, better co-ordinated, more effective and efficient in every way if one department of government was charged with the responsibility for administering all federal agricultural matters. We further believe that this could be best achieved by placing those governmental activities closely associated with agriculture, under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Therefore we request the Committee's attention to this proposal with a view to a considered recommendation to the Government in this regard.

Jurisdiction of Producer Marketing Boards

In view of the very unsatisfactory situation that exists with reference to marketing of farm products, it is quite possible there will be increased producer interest in organizing further marketing boards under the producers' own supervision. A number of such marketing boards are already operating in various areas of Canada, but due to recent and former court judgments, the fields of jurisdiction and competence as between provincial and federal authority, leaves considerable room for insecurity and uncertainty in regard to the operation of producer marketing boards.

We therefore urge that this Committee recommend a conference be called of representatives of the federal and provincial government departments of agriculture, together with other agricultural organizations across Canada, to jointly work out a practical and workable plan to meet present-day marketing requirements and make recommendations for the elimination of jurisdictional uncertainty herein referred to.

Greater Use of Port Churchill

Very closely associated with the grain transportation problem is the present and potential use of Port Churchill. While a considerable amount of increased acreage of farm lands has been brought under cultivation, and further expansion continues to a limited extent each year, we find that comparable expansion of terminal elevator space has not accompanied this increased grain production. As a result, we believe, the time has now come for the Government to seriously consider the provision of additional terminal space in order to prevent repetition of the serious congestion which has prevailed.

We believe that such increased terminal capacity can be most economically provided by doubling the existing capacity of the terminal elevator at Port Churchill, having in mind the much shorter and cheaper rail haul plus the fact that such grain can be loaded direct into ocean boats without necessity of double and triple handling, as is the case with much of the grain travelling the Great Lakes route. We believe this would be a forward development, and we would also strongly recommend that immediate consideration be given to a joint through-freight rate for grain going to Churchill, in order that farmers living adjacent to C.P.R. points may not be deprived of participating in its advantages. We would further recommend that the supervision of these elevators be placed under the Board of Grain Commissioners, or some other suitable western representative body, rather than under the Harbour Commission as is at present the case. The Harbour Commission of course would continue to operate the harbour and port facilities, but we feel the operation of the elevators themselves are quite foreign to its legitimate sphere of activity.

General Agricultural Improvement

In connection with guaranteeing and safeguarding the production of the nation's future food supplies, we offer several general recommendations. The first is that in the event the handling and marketing of grain is to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture, as we have previously suggested, then we would recommend that the Agricultural Prices Support Act be amended to provide adequate floor prices for cereal grains. If, on the other hand, it is felt desirable to deal with cereal grains separate and apart from the general Act, then we would urge that a further amendment be made to the Canadian Wheat Board Act to provide equal protection for cereal grains as is now provided for other agricultural products. The second point is, in order to ensure the continuous supply of the necessary volume of foodstuffs to take care of our home requirements, plus a sufficient volume of export sales (and having in mind that agriculture is now operating in a highly mechanized age when the large capital investments required result in many young farmers not having sufficient capital to become established) we would urge the Committee to study and recommend a plan which could be worked out on a joint basis between the federal and provincial governments concerned in each of the provinces, to provide long-term agricultural credits, with payments spread over a number of years at a low interest rate.

South Saskatchewan River Dam

We recommend thirdly, an immediate start on the South Saskatchewan River Dam, the completion of which will provide a substantial amount of stability to the prairie region generally. We understand from press reports that there has been some delay in starting this project due to a suggestion that the cost of generating electricity at the project would be excessive. We would point out, however, that the matter of generating electricity was a secondary consideration. The primary motive of the South Saskatchewan River project is conservation of water supplies, and the irrigation of a very substantial area of agricultural land. We are perturbed also concerning references to the attempts of some individuals to place this project on the basis of an annual operating budget. While it is true the overall expenditure, as in any other project, must receive due consideration, we nevertheless submit that it is completely erroneous to approach a long range development program and endeavour to appraise its value on the basis of an annual operating balance sheet. It is necessary that we approach a large development project of this nature with vision, courage and confidence. Had we adopted the attitude of judging a development scheme on the basis of an annual balance sheet, the first transcontinental railway would never have been built. It is because we had men of vision at the time that this great development was made possible. The South Saskatchewan River development and irrigation project must be approached in like manner as the complementary benefits which will accrue from such a development, like those of every worthwhile national project, are impossible to calculate on an annual operating budget basis. We therefore would urge that this Committee recommend the immediate commencement of the South Saskatchewan River development project in the light of its importance to the prairie region and Canada as a whole.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we would recapitulate main points concerning which we urge you will recommend to the Government of Canada for immediate action.

1. Emergency Program for livestock marketing:

Establishment of a national marketing board;

Separate the marketing of agricultural products into two classifications, domestic and export.

Action to conserve the dairy industry.

2. Separate domestic price of wheat from IWA prices.
3. Amendment to The Canada Grain Act.
4. Royal Commission to study grain handling, storing, transportation, drying, overages, weighing, mixing, grading and selling.
5. Recommend permanent appointment of Transport Controller.
6. Expansion of Canadian Wheat Board personnel to include producer representation on policy level.
7. Recommend full responsibility for administering all federal agricultural matters be under jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture.
8. Enabling legislation for producer marketing boards.
9. Greater use of Port Churchill.
10. South Saskatchewan River dam project.

And finally, we seek your support of a Bill for the Voluntary Requisition for payment of farm union dues through the Canadian Wheat Board.

May we again express our appreciation for the opportunity to make this presentation to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization of the House of Commons.

All of which is respectfully submitted on behalf of the Interprovincial Farm Union Council comprising the:

Manitoba Farmers Union
Saskatchewan Farmers Union
Farmers Union of Alberta

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I want to draw your attention to the fact that tomorrow is Wednesday. I have taken it for granted that no one will want to sit tomorrow night. Is that agreed?

Agreed.

Mr. ROSS: Isn't the House sitting tomorrow night, Wednesday night?

The CHAIRMAN: Not tomorrow night. I wonder if the committee would be agreeable to sitting for another 15 or 20 minutes. Mr. Phelps could summarize, and we might get in a few questions and that would finish it.

Mr. ARGUE: I do not see why Mr. Phelps' appearance should be confined to one sitting of the committee.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Suppose we gave every other witness the same time that we have given Mr. Phelps. I see a half dozen here in the room who want to be heard.

Mr. ARGUE: But does not Mr. Phelps' organization represent the others? Are there others here to be heard?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Yes, we have the United Grain Growers, and I see over there a representative of the Saskatchewan pool, of the Manitoba pool and I met a representative of the Alberta pool upstairs.

Mr. ARGUE: Does each one of them want to make representations?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: So I understand.

Mr. QUELCH: Could not we speak on behalf of the pools?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I would rather think the pools would want to make a statement for themselves. Is Mr. Phelps speaking for the pools?

The WITNESS: No. I would like to touch on the matter of our farm storage and delivery quotas.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: We have debated that in the House of Commons, and I rather think I won the debate. I don't know.

The WITNESS: I would like to mention this matter of feedbanks. I heard that discussed this afternoon.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: We discussed that this afternoon.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Chairman, will this entire brief be printed in the proceedings?

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. It will be printed complete. Is it agreeable that we have this brief printed in the record and that from now on we just have sort of a summary by Mr. Phelps and a few more questions?

Agreed.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief because I appreciate a very good hearing. I would like to draw your attention to the clause here regarding producers' representation on the Wheat Board. We have something to say here about the report of the Wheat Board. It is commending it. There are one or two points in the report that we question. You will notice the first point that we question is recorded on page 2 of the report that was discussed this afternoon. We question the advisability of our Canadian delegates on the Wheat Council agreeing to further concessions with regard to our present agreement, having in mind the very low price which governs. We are not objecting to the fulfilment of present commitments, even if prices previously agreed to are low; but we certainly question increasing the amounts unless there is a definite or implied obligation to do so.

The second objection there that is noted is in regard to prices on lower grades of grain.

I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the other section here, the voluntary requisition. I would like to say briefly that we feel that these moneys are moneys that belong to the farmers and they ought to have some jurisdiction in how they be allocated, and we would certainly commend to the attention and sympathetic consideration of the committee our request in that regard.

Division of authority. We have brought that to the attention of the government in all seriousness and kindness. We say here we are not criticising the actions of any particular minister, but we think for the purpose of better administration some consolidation would be required. A greater use of the port of Churchill is recommended in our brief. You have heard about that on many occasions. The South Saskatchewan river dam is also mentioned here. One point I would like to make is this—

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Is that not outside the terms of reference of this committee?

The WITNESS: Well, if it is objectionable, Mr. Chairman, I won't press it, but as representing the farmers there is one point here I would like to draw to the attention of this Agriculture Committee, and that is there has been a move to try to bring out the idea that the development of power is too expensive at that particular site. That is not the primary objective of the South Saskatchewan river project. Secondly, there has been a move to place that project on an annual operating basis, and on a balance sheet, as it were. We think that is erroneous. If you had tried to put the operation of the trans-continental railways on a balance sheet basis you never would have had one. We would like this committee to keep this in mind.

In conclusion, I would just like to recapitulate the points concerning which we urge you will recommend to the government of Canada for immediate action.

1. Emergency Program for livestock marketing:
Establishment of a national marketing board;
Separate the marketing of agricultural products into two classifications, domestic and export.
Action to conserve the dairy industry.
2. Separate domestic price of wheat from IWA prices.
3. Amendment to The Canada Grain Act.
4. Royal Commission to study grain handling, storing, transportation, drying, overages, weighing, mixing, grading and selling.
5. Recommend permanent appointment of Transport Controller.
6. Expansion of Canadian Wheat Board personnel to include producer representation on policy level.
7. Recommend full responsibility for administering all federal agricultural matters be under jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture.
8. Enabling legislation for producer marketing boards.
9. Greater use of Port Churchill.
10. South Saskatchewan River dam project.

And finally, we seek your support of a Bill for the Voluntary Requisition for payment of farm union dues through the Canadian Wheat Board.

May we again express our appreciation for the opportunity to make this presentation to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization of the House of Commons.

All of which is respectfully submitted on behalf of the Interprovincial Farm Union Council comprising the:

Manitoba Farmers Union
Saskatchewan Farmers Union
Farmers Union of Alberta.

Mr. LAING: Will Mr. Phelps permit one question? Is there any concern among your members that in the case of feed grains they are selling today at prices which, notwithstanding the payment of an annual amount by the federal government for federal freight assistance of \$15 million to \$18 million, it has reached a point where it is almost impossible to transfer them into livestock or livestock products and make a profit. In my own province feed wheat, which is 4 and 5 or 5 and 6 mixed, which was retailing the day the war ended at \$28 per ton, is today \$88 per ton.

The WITNESS: I sympathize; in talking to the farmers in the province in which I was born, which is Ontario, I find invariably that question comes up. It is one of the reasons for this paragraph on feedbanks. I heard the discussion this afternoon in the committee. I was very interested in the point of view of the Ontario consumer in regard to feed grains, and we would agree with that and state here that we believe a plan should be worked out for more direct sales than is in operation at the present time. We state it right here in our brief. One of the reasons, among others, is the feed that you are purchasing is feed not directly sold, but sold through brokerage and commission firms, and when you take into account the margins that are accumulating through extra handling, it raises the price considerably that has been our investigation so far.

Mr. LAING: They are rendering a service ordinarily carried on by the banks in our province.

Mr. WRIGHT: If I might answer Mr. Laing, the evidence we got from the Wheat Board indicated that we are selling a good rate of grain, that is 5, at \$55 a ton. Now, the government pays the freight on it to the destination, so that would indicate that whoever are handling your grain are getting the difference between \$55 a ton and \$88 a ton, which you say you paid. I think it is a problem for yourselves in British Columbia.

Mr. LAING: The same people sold it at \$28 a ton the day the war ended.

Mr. JUTRAS: As to the freight allowance, I do not think all the freight is paid. For instance, Mr. Gour mentions that he was getting \$3 a ton, but actually it is more than that.

Mr. BRYCE: It is \$6 a ton.

The WITNESS: I must apologize. I did not think you were from British Columbia, and I was thinking in terms of Ontario. You notice in this paragraph we include western consumers as well.

Mr. LAING: You favour the continuation of FFA?

The WITNESS: Free freight, you mean?

Mr. LAING: Federal freight assistance.

The WITNESS: Oh, yes, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? If not, we will adjourn until 11:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. ROSS: It is understood Mr. Phelps will be heard on these overages when the other officials are here?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: I wish to express my appreciation for your consideration in listening to our brief.

HD
1781
A38
1952
NO 10
(HOUSE OF COMMONS

Sixth Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Agriculture and Colonization

Chairman: ARTHUR J. BATER, ESQ.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Respecting the Report of the

BOARD OF GRAIN COMMISSIONERS, 1951

No. 10

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1952

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1952

Second, Third and Fourth Reports to the House

WITNESSES:

Mr. D. G. McKenzie, Chief Commissioner, Mr. John Vallance, and Mr. R. W. Milner, Commissioners, Mr. A. T. Calder, Secretary, Mr. A. F. Dollery, Chief Grain Inspector, Dr. J. A. Anderson, Chief Chemist, Mr. S. M. Capon, Chief Weighmaster, all of the Board of Grain Commissioners; Mr. J. L. Phelps, President of the Interprovincial Farmers Union Council.

REPORTS TO THE HOUSE

THURSDAY, June 19, 1952

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization begs leave to present the following as a

SECOND REPORT

Your Committee has considered Bill No. 246, An Act to amend The Canada Grain Act, and has agreed to report it with amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR J. BATER,
Chairman.

TUESDAY, June 24, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization begs leave to present the following as its

THIRD REPORT

On April 29 your Committee was instructed to inquire into and report on the subject of the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the Province of Saskatchewan and its attendant ramifications. Since that date, your Committee has held 17 meetings and has heard the testimony of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, the Veterinary Director General and other senior officers of the Department, stationed both in Ottawa and in Regina, regarding the circumstances surrounding the outbreak and spread of the disease and the measures now being employed to bring it under control.

Having considered the correspondence and records submitted together with the evidence adduced, your Committee is of the opinion that the officials of the Health of Animals Division, Department of Agriculture, followed the well defined plans laid down through long experience gained working in co-operation with their counterparts in the United States Bureau of Animal Industry to diagnose and combat stomatitis and foot and mouth disease. As a result of this action, foot and mouth disease in Canada is definitely under control and appears to have been eradicated.

Your Committee recognizes that it was and is most important that practices in Canada be similar to those in the United States so that Canadian livestock and other agricultural products may be permitted to re-enter the United States market at the earliest possible date, and commends the officials of the Health of Animals Division, Department of Agriculture, for having adhered to those practices both with regard to diagnosing and combating the disease.

Your Committee recommends continued and extensive research into all methods of diagnosis and control of animal contagious diseases in Canada.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence in relation thereto is appended.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR J. BATER,
Chairman.

TUESDAY, June 24, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization begs leave to present the following as a

FOURTH REPORT

On April 28, 1952, the House referred to the Committee the Report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the crop year 1950-51, together with the Report of the Board of Grain Commissioners for 1951.

Your Committee has considered and approved the above mentioned reports.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence in relation thereto is appended.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR J. BATER,
Chairman.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, June 18, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11.30 o'clock a.m. this day. Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Blue, Bruneau, Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Corry, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Ferrie, Gauthier (*La-pointe*), George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Laing, MacKenzie, Major, Masse, McCubbin, McWilliam, Quelch, Richard (*St. Maurice-Lafleche*), Roberge, Ross (*Souris*), Studer, Ward, White (*Middlesex East*), Welbourn, Wood, Wright, Wylie, Whitman.

In attendance: Rt. Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce; and from the Board of Grain Commissioners: Mr. D. G. McKenzie, Chief Commissioner, Mr. John Vallance and Mr. R. W. Milner, Commissioners, Mr. A. T. Calder, Secretary, Mr. A. F. Dollery, Chief Grain Inspector, Dr. J. A. Anderson, Chief Chemist, Mr. S. M. Capon, Chief Weighmaster.

Mr. McKenzie presented the Report of the Board of Grain Commissioners and assisted by Messrs. Vallance, Milner, Calder, Dollery, Anderson and Capon answered questions.

At 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 3.15 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 3.15 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Bater, Bruneau, Bryce, Charlton, Corry, Dinsdale, Fair, Ferrie, George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, MacKenzie, Masse, McCubbin, Quelch, Roberge, Ross (*Souris*), Studer, Ward, Whitman, Wood, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Rt. Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce; Mr. J. L. Phelps, President of the Interprovincial Farmers Union Council, and President of the Farmers Union of Saskatchewan; Mr. H. A. Britton, Director, Manitoba Farmers Union; and from the Board of Grain Commissioners: Mr. D. G. McKenzie, Chief Commissioner, Mr. John Vallance and Mr. R. W. Milner, Commissioners, Mr. A. T. Calder, Secretary, Mr. A. F. Dollery, Chief Grain Inspector, Dr. J. A. Anderson, Chief Chemist, Mr. S. M. Capon, Chief Weighmaster.

The Committee further considered the report of the Board of Grain Commissioners, questions thereon being answered by the witnesses.

Mr. Phelps was recalled and made a brief statement.

The witnesses retired.

On motion of Mr. Ferrie,

Resolved,—That the Report of the Board of Grain Commissioners of Canada, 1951, be adopted and that the Chairman report the same to the House.

Mr. Howe expressed his appreciation of the work being done by the Board of Grain Commissioners.

The Committee considered Bill No. 246,—An Act to amend the Canada Grain Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 were adopted.

On Clause 3:

On motion of Mr. George,

Resolved,—That subclause (2) of Clause 3 be deleted.

Clause 3 was adopted, as amended.

Clauses 4 and 5 were adopted.

The preamble, the title and the bill, as amended, were adopted and the Chairman ordered to report the same to the House.

At 5.40 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

TUESDAY, June 24, 1952.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11.30 o'clock a.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Arthur J. Bater, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Argue, Aylesworth, Black (*Chateauquay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Charlton, Corry, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Dumas, Fair, Ferrie, George, Gour (*Russell*), Harkness, Hetland, Jutras, Jones, Laing, MacKenzie, MacLean (*Queens*), Major, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Quelch, Ross (*Souris*), Sinnott, Studer, Whitman, Ward, Wood, Welbourn, Wright, Wylie.

In attendance: Rt. Hon. J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture.

The Chairman presented the Third Report of the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure as follows:

Your Subcommittee was, on June 16, instructed to submit a draft Report to the House concerning the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Saskatchewan.

Your Subcommittee has considered and adopted the appended draft Report to the House and recommends it to the Committee.

(*For copy of Report see THIRD REPORT to the House*).

Mr. Laing moved,—

That the Third Report of the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure presented this day be now concurred in.

Mr. Charlton moved in amendment thereto,—

That the last four words of Mr. Laing's motion be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

be amended by inserting after the word *control* at the end of the first paragraph of the said draft report, the following:

Your Committee is of the opinion that the evidence available to it discloses that there has been laxity and gross negligence with respect to the carrying out of the responsibilities of the office of the Veterinary Director General of Canada.

That the failure of the Minister of Agriculture to assure competent performance of duty by those responsible to him has cost the Canadian farmer a serious loss in export and domestic markets.

Your Committee regrets the fact that the taking of evidence was restricted to federal government employees only and feels that the scope of the enquiry should have included independent witnesses from the area of foot-and-mouth infection.

Your Committee strongly recommends the urgent need in the Department of Agriculture for greater co-operation between, and utilization of, facilities at its disposal for the diagnosis of animal diseases, and as evidence of the benefits to be derived by such co-operation would cite the excellent work accomplished since February 16th, 1952, to eradicate this serious threat to the Canadian livestock industry.

Mr. Fair moved in amendment to the amendment,—

That the Third Report of the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be not now concurred in but that the draft report appended thereto be referred back to the Subcommittee for redrafting.

The question having been put on the amendment to the amendment, it was negatived.

Mr. Charlton's amendment was negatived on the following division:

Yeas: Messrs. Argue, Aylesworth, Browne (*St. John's West*), Bryce, Cardiff, Catherwood, Charlton, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Harkness, Jones, MacLean (*Queens*), Ross (*Souris*), Wright. 14

Nays: Messrs. Anderson; Black (*Chateauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie*), Corry, Dumas, Ferrie, George, Gour (*Russell*), Hetland, Jutras, Laing, MacKenzie, Major, McCubbin, McLean (*Huron-Perth*), McWilliam, Studer, Sinnott, Ward, Welbourn, Whitman, Wood. 21

The main motion was adopted, on division.

The draft report was adopted and the Chairman instructed to present the same to the House as a Third Report.

At 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

JUNE 18, 1952,
11:30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Now, gentlemen, the first order of business this morning will be to hear and discuss the report of the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada for the year 1951. I will now introduce and call upon Mr. D. G. McKenzie, the chief commissioner of the board, who will introduce his fellow commissioners and the officers of the commission who are with him here on this occasion, and then we will have Mr. McKenzie start to summarize the report. I will now call upon Mr. McKenzie, the chief commissioner of the board.

Mr. D. G. McKenzie, Chief Commissioner, Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister and gentlemen. May I at first say to you how happy we are, both my colleagues and my associates and the chief executive officers in the board, at the opportunity that is presented to us to give you as much information as possible about the work of the Board of Grain Commissioners. The Board of Grain Commissioners is charged, as you know, with the administration of the Canada Grain Act, and there are one or two other responsibilities that I want to mention to you so that you will have the picture reasonably complete. We are charged with the responsibilities of collecting assessments, made under the P.F.A. Act, charged against the grain under that Act, and then, sir, we have the administration of the Inland Water Freight Rates Act under which we fix maximum freight rates on grain moving across the lakes and so on, and, fourthly, we operate five interior terminal elevators and one elevator at Prince Rupert.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in accordance with your request, I would like to introduce my two colleagues, and then the executive officers that we have with us this morning. Immediately on my right is Mr. John Vallance, my associate on the board; Mr. Roy Milner, our fellow commissioner; Mr. Arnold Calder, secretary of the board; Mr. Arthur Dollery, our chief grain inspector; Dr. Andy Anderson, our chief chemist; and Mr. S. M. Capon, our chief weighmaster.

Gentlemen, these men are all here fully conversant with the details of their respective departments, and they will join with us in giving you the fullest possible information in respect to our work.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not prepared a brief. I take it that we are here for the purpose of discussing the report of the Board of Grain Commissioners that I think has been supplied to everyone. I do not propose unless you so desire, to read the full report, but will draw your attention to the main aspects of it.

The first page is merely a summarization of the general conditions. If you will think back to the year 1951, we had a crop a little larger than the average, a crop that presented many problems in respect of marketing because of the nature of it—it was a badly frozen crop, and so on. And then we come over to probably a question that interests most, the question of overages in country elevators, and I do not think, sir, I can do better than read you this so that the picture will be presented to you in full.

OVERAGES—COUNTRY ELEVATORS

Country elevator annual returns covering 1949-50 operations showed limited gross shortages on wheat, rye and flaxseed, and effective August 1, 1950, the Board authorized additional shrinkage allowance for these grains as follows:

Straight Grade Grain

Wheat increased from $\frac{1}{4}\%$ to $\frac{3}{8}\%$.

Flax increased from 1% to $1\frac{1}{2}\%$.

Rye increased from $\frac{1}{4}\%$ to $\frac{1}{2}\%$.

Tough Grain

Rye increased from $\frac{3}{4}\%$ to 1%.

Damp Grain

Rye increased from 1% to $1\frac{1}{2}\%$.

Operating under this revised shrinkage tariff, the country elevators in 1950-51 showed a combined gross overage for all grains of 19,075,928 lbs. from total handlings of 32,746,612,426 lbs., or an average of .06 per cent in terms of handlings.

Moderate gross overages appeared in wheat (.03 per cent), oats (.19 per cent) and barley (.09 per cent), but were higher for flaxseed (.59 per cent). Rye and corn weighted out with gross shortages of .31 per cent and 2.19 per cent respectively.

Due to congested storage, some 1,974 elevators were unable to complete their weighovers for the 1950-51 season, and hence the results of their operations were estimated. Further details of the breakdown in country elevator returns appear in table form below:

	1950-51	1949-50	1948-49
Elevators reporting shortages	897	1,797	2,259
Elevators reporting neither shortages nor overages	2,030	120	52
Elevators reporting overages of less than .25% ..	1,475	2,440	2,239
Elevators reporting overages from .25% to .50% ..	587	456	466
Elevators reporting overages over .50%	78	123	116
Totals	5,067	4,936	5,132

The CHAIRMAN: As Mr. McKenzie has now read out the overages with regard to country elevators; before passing on to the next item, Inspection of Grain, has any member of the committee any questions they desire to ask in connection with overages?

By Mr. Argue:

Q. I see there are 2,030 elevators reporting neither shortages nor overages. In view of the fact that the wheat is reported in pounds here, how do you account for them not having shown an overage or a shortage? It will have to be one or the other.—A. The explanation of that is simply because the elevators were so full that they could not be weighed over. We do not know whether there is a shortage or an overage in them, and so we just classify them as having neither one nor the other. On balance, when they are weighed over they will break out pretty much as the picture reveals to you.

Q. In the text it shows 1,974 elevators were unable to complete their weighovers for the 1950-51 season, and in the table that figure is shown as 2,030. How do you account for the difference?—A. Some of those that weighed over showed a break-even position—

Mr. ROSS: What percentage of overages is allowed under the Grain Act, and also what becomes of those overages? How are they disposed of?

The WITNESS: In answering your first question as to what percentage of overages is allowed under the Act, there is no overage allowed at all. Actually there is a shrinkage allowance provided, but that shrinkage allowance is never intended to provide an overage of any kind. Now, when you ask me what becomes of it, I think that question might better be directed to the Wheat Board, because they take over all overages of wheat.

Mr. FAIR: And buy them at a certain price?

The WITNESS: Yes, at an agreed price.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The Board pays the initial price at the time.

Mr. ROSS: They take over the entire quantity of the overages at the prevailing prices?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. FAIR: And the price goes to the elevator company that has accumulated the overage?

The WITNESS: Presumably. We do not know where it goes, but we suspect the elevator company gets it.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Would it be logical to expect that when the grain is harvested with an abnormal amount of moisture in it, the tendency would be to have a shortage rather than an overage where the grain has been dried artificially?—A. Well, you start your question by saying if there is a normal percentage of moisture.

Q. Abnormal.—A. Abnormal—I'm sorry, I did not get it. That might work that way. For instance, if you take in a car of, say, 2,000 bushels of damp wheat to a country elevator today, they take their shrinkage allowance, and then that wheat moves out of the elevator almost immediately or within two or three weeks, it is conceivable that the full amount of the moisture has not evaporated in that time, and if there is any remaining it might tend to create an overage.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: With the rapid movement of the great volume of damp grain, the tendency is that it does so without any shrinkage. I think it tends to build up overages rather than create shortages.

Mr. VALLANCE: Another factor enters into that, and that is the conditions that grain is subjected to, both in the country elevator and in transit, and that for quite a considerable period of time there will be no evaporation. I would say this would be the condition in the cold months when it is moving, in the months of November, December and January and maybe on into February. In those months the evaporation will be very little, if any, and in fact, although the elevator men would not agree with that, if the evaporation was taking place to the extent that some of us might think, rather than evaporation taking place you could have spoilage in the grain. In other words, the heat that would cause evaporation by virtue of the very fact of it being there would start the wheat to heat or ferment.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. These overages here represent weights and not grades?—A. Yes, weights.

Q. Is there any place in your report where it indicates the change in grades in country elevators?—A. No, not specifically, I do not think.

Q. Then, Mr. Chairman, would this be the place where we should discuss the matter of whether there is any overage in grades in the country elevators when they transfer their stocks to the Winnipeg inspection department?—A. I

think if you could consult the trade on that you would find that their grade losses far outweighed their grade gains.

Q. You have no figures in the Board of Grain Commissioners possession as to the position with regard to grades paid to farmers at country elevators?

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Wright, if you have in your hand a copy of this compilation of data relating to country elevator operations you will find under page 21, at the bottom, a table showing the net weight overages and shortages by grades in percentages. This is available to the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT: We have not got it, but could we have it?

The CHAIRMAN: We can make it available to you.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Why not distribute it now while we are discussing the subject?

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Is there any place in the report showing overages and shortages in terminal elevators?—A. Yes, we will deal with that later on.

Q. Have you given any consideration to making overages in country elevators placed in the same category as overages in terminal elevators, to surrender to Her Majesty?—A. I do not think you could deal with that in the same way at all. They are two distinct and separate problems.

Q. Do you mind giving me a reason for your statement?—A. You are thinking of the application of section 138 of the Act to the terminal operations. That section would not apply and could not be applied effectively to overages in country houses.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think if you follow through what the chief commissioner told you, after you have had your $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent under sections 138 and 138-A, if you did that in your country elevator, you would have an overage greater than you have now, because the overage in the country elevators—not trying to defend them, but a statement of fact—is less than $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent, so that section 138 could not be applied even if it were worded to take in the country elevators and perform the function that you have in mind.

Mr. ARGUE: Then do you think there is no way that the request of farmers and certain farm organizations, that these overages should be taken from the elevator companies, can be applied?

Mr. VALLANCE: If you direct that question to the Board of Grain Commissioners, my answer to you would be this: As the chairman of the board pointed out to you, we are saddled with the responsibility of the administration of a statute, and there is nowhere in the statute where we can do what you are suggesting. It may be that it will be amended as a result of suggestions from this committee; some suggestions may be made and embodied in your report that will recommend something like what you are talking about now, which will have to be given consideration by those responsible for a necessary amendment, or in whatever way the matter will be dealt with.

Mr. ARGUE: If such an amendment were placed in the Act, do you think it could be administered?

Mr. VALLANCE: Once we saw the amendment and if you asked our opinion then I think we could at least give our own opinion as to the possibility and advisability, and whether it would attain the objects you have in mind, and until then I would not hazard a guess at all.

Mr. ARGUE: It seems to me the rate of overages is so small and the feeling among producers is pretty strong, that it would be in everybody's interest, and when there is an allowance given I do not see why the elevator companies could have much objection to it, because the overage is an overage and they do not pay any overage.

Mr. VALLANCE: We agree with that statement.

Mr. HETLAND: It says here that 78 elevators reported an overage of $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent. Now, that, of course I understand, is against the Canada Grain Act to have that overage in the elevator. They are supposed to be close, that is to say they are supposed to follow their shrinkage allowance, and anybody who is over $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent is liable to lose their licence. What do you do in a case like that?

The WITNESS: Well, perhaps Mr. Chairman, I might take a moment just to describe to you the method by which we try to check country elevators. First of all, in each of the three provinces we have our assistant commissioners who are checking these country houses, talking to the local agents and advising them against the dangers incident to building up what we regard as excessive overages.

Secondly, the various elevator companies each year furnish us with a sworn statement as to their position at the end of the year when the cut-off is taken. If we find any country agent with what we might regard to be an excessive overage and particularly if it appears two or three years in a row, we call those agents in to a meeting and we demand of them some explanation as to how these overages occur and if the position is, we think, deserving of severe discipline, we may suspend the licence of the elevator company at that point.

That is the only means by which we can discipline. You men may be interested in knowing that last year we took that very action with one point in one of the provinces in western Canada. This year the agent's results as far as we at the moment are able to discern are quite favourable.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think, Mr. Chairman, it is also fair to tell the committee that many times it is quite within the power of the Board of Grain Commissioners to refuse to licence an elevator agent once they get in a position when we think they have acquired too heavy grain overages. We can refuse to licence an elevator operator so that he would be unable to obtain work with any other company.

The WITNESS: May I add one other remark because we are anxious that you get all the details that is possible. There is a possibility of acquiring some overages in a country elevator in a perfectly legitimate way particularly in elevators that have efficient cleaning machinery. They take out wild oats, small wheat, some barley out of their wheat and so on. They perhaps re-clean those screenings and put the recaptured feed grain into feed barley or oats and that is not shown as a receipt of the house; it is a straight salvage proposition. The farmer has refused to take his screenings away but it does tend to reflect an overage in that country house and I do not think that anybody can be critical because that is a straight salvage proposition. It would be a waste otherwise in that the farmer has refused to take his own screenings to which he is entitled.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. This is a point I was going to bring up because I know there are a lot of cases where farmers refuse to take their screenings and that is thrown into the feed and it builds up your overages and a lot of elevator agents are very much concerned because they have too large an overage.—A. Well, if you will check the figures we will make available here you will find that the apparent excessive overages are often in coarse grain and that is one of the contributing factors to that overage.

Mr. QUELCH: But in times of congestion it is very seldom possible for the country elevator to make a screening operation. I know cases where farmers have asked for screenings and owing to this congestion it is impossible for the elevator to clean the grain.

Mr. VALLANCE: In that case that would not be a reason why he has an overage because he did not reclaim anything out of the grain. Where they had cleaned it this applies and if a farmer refuses to take back his screenings.

The WITNESS: Another point is very frequently developing these days. A lot of farmers bring their seed grain into the country elevator for cleaning, for seed purposes. Now, grain of that kind obviously is screened pretty heavily and the farmer does not take the screenings away. The elevator operator has got to get rid of that somewhere so he might push it over his screens again and take out a substantial quantity from that that might have feed value.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think too it is only fair to say to the committee that this point that we are discussing now comes as a result of the investigations that we have made in these meetings that we hold with these elevator operators and the excuses or reasons they give us for their overages. Some of them say that the scales were out. We inquire of them if it was the scale. The Weights and Measure test it but in the operation of the elevator it is likely to get out of kilter. Some of you know that the loads carried onto the elevator scales now are somewhat more heavy than what they should be and those are the reasons the boys advance as to why they have the overages. We, of course, do not condone; it is merely a statement of fact in that investigation.

By Mr. Fair:

Q. Speaking of overage, the excessive dockage would also account for overages, wouldn't it, because in many instances the agent does not allow for dockage or in many cases does not load for dockage and that is 1 per cent, 1½ per cent or 2 per cent or whatever the case may be?—A. You are quite right and when we see a net overage from a country elevator we immediately worry about their dockage practice. Perhaps it is only fair to say this, that if the producer would read the Canadian Grain Act and familiarize himself with the protection that is provided in it he could get away from that and send in the required sample of his grain in for government inspection. I do not want to take the time of the committee to describe the processes now but if we find there is evidence of what we regard as an excessive net overage the first thing we inquire about is their dockage practice.

Q. I realize that there is a lot of protection provided for practically everything but I think you will also realize that the number of farmers who haul their own grain is not very many and when a trucker comes in his interest is to get—or a lot of truckers anyway, their interest is to bring their load in and away back and haul another one and weighing in many cases is not as accurate as it ought to be either. I know that from practical experience of over thirty years hauling to elevators to different companies—pools and organizations and so forth and I know that that accounts for overages being shown in some country elevators.

I think it is quite correct. On the other hand, we find it very interesting in many country elevator stations to find a number that voluntarily let the truck driver or the farmer weigh his own load.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Have you run into many cases or any cases of elevator agents who underweigh the farmer's load as a practice and then another question I want to ask: Is there any method by which the elevator company or the agent should consistently practise underweighing that they can dispose of the overages without the board being aware of it?—A. Now, answering your first question, I would say this, that if any agent persistently practices underweighing he would not have his job very long.

Mr. VALLANCE: Provided it was drawn to our attention.

The WITNESS: Or if the farmer became suspicious.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. There is no loophole?—A. Well, I cannot state positively if there are such cases.

Q. I had one case brought to my attention—I won't mention the name of the man or the company—but I had one agent tell me that when he became an agent for that company that he was told that if he could not get enough grain as an overage to pay his own salary he was not worth a darn to his company.—A. You let me know the names of the man and the company.

Q. I imagine that is an isolated case and I do not want it to be taken as a reflection on agents or companies at all but I have had that told to me and I wondered if there was a method by which any possibility of that practice could be done away with?—A. They could not get away with it long.

Mr. FAIR: Mr. Chairman, I had a brother who bought grain for two years and the same proposition was put up to him and he said: "If I have to steal my wages I will do without."

Mr. VALLANCE: Truly his name was Fair.

Mr. FAIR: Yes, and I also know on certain occasions elevator agents made out cheques to certain farmers in the district and when they cashed those cheques they turned over a slight amount to the elevator operator.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think you will admit that that practice could not be carried out today because of the quota book which is given to only the producer. It must be entered in the book. Now, I have met no producers who would use the quota book to that end. We have not found that yet.

Mr. FAIR: I am not suggesting the practice is carried on today but I do know in two or three cases that it happened not very recently. I know that for a fact.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. What about the company that is in the feed business and selling feed grain. There is no way there that they could take their overage and put it into feed and sell it?—A. They would not get away with it long. We would soon get them.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we pass on to inspection of grain?

Mr. WRIGHT: Just one point I wanted to raise with regard to this question.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What steps does the board take to inform the farmer of the protection he has under the Canada Grain Act? It seems to me from observations in the past two or three years that very little has been done in good public relations between the board and the farmer—not as good as there could have been in acquainting him with the board's purpose and the measures that he can use to protect himself. What does the board do to acquaint the farmers with their functions, the protection that the farmer has under the Canada Grain Act, where he lays a complaint and so on?—A. There are two or three ways I might mention. First of all, I have already indicated to you that in every province an assistant commissioner is touring the province all the time doing that very type of thing. Any time we get a complaint from a farmer in we send our assistant commissioner out to see him and he is trying always to advise the farmer as to the protection he has.

Q. In what way?—A. By personal contact.

Q. That is pretty slow, if you have to go to individual farmers in the province.—A. Just a minute. In addition to that we go out, Mr. Vallance and myself and Mr. Milner when he is available and address farmers' gatherings wherever we can.

Mr. VALLANCE: And on request.

The WITNESS: You gentlemen might be interested to know that we addressed a provincial farmers' gathering last winter with several hundred farmers present. At the meeting I asked them: "How many of you farmers have read the Grain Act or have it in your possession?" Do you know how many held up their hands?—just exactly two. We make it available to them but we cannot make the farmer get hold of it and study it if he is not interested.

By Mr. Wright:

I think your idea of going out and addressing meetings and I think the idea of your assistant commissioner going out is a good idea and I think that is the only way you are going to be able to get these things across to the average farmer. The fact that the Grain Act is there does not mean a thing.

Mr. BRYCE: Copies are not available at any of the elevators, are they?

Mr. VALLANCE: Well, I think most elevators have a copy of the Act but there is no numbers of copies available to the farmers.

Mr. BRYCE: I thought that if there were a dozen copies or so left there it would be up to the farmer to acquaint himself with the regulations.

Mr. VALLANCE: Being two of a kind—I recognize your chirp—I think the fact that the farmer goes into the elevator gangway and he sees the regulations up there, surely after 47 years experience in Saskatchewan there are not many farmers that surely do not look at the regulations that we demand be posted in every elevator in the gangway.

Mr. BRYCE: I know a Scotsman would but it is the other people I am worrying about.

Mr. VALLANCE: Well, possibly there may be too many of the other people and not enough Scotsmen. I think it is a fact and I think it is also a fact that the chairman has said this that we have never refused to address a farmers' meeting at any time in any of the three provinces where the invitation was extended. We have no organization where we can go out and create meetings.

I agree with Mr. Wright that ever since I have been in Canada and ever since the Act came into being in 1919 that there has not been enough publicity.

There are organizations—I am not going to name them—that are in existence that are under the control of the farmers themselves that I think—and I have been to three or four—that I think could make a tremendous contribution in an educational program to make the farmer acquainted not with the privileges but with his rights under the Act.

Mr. ARGUE: There is not much use giving this Act to the average farmer.

Mr. VALLANCE: I agree with you.

Mr. ARGUE: The average member of parliament, including myself, has not read anything in the Act. Why don't you get out a nice pamphlet with a nice attractive cover like this one. More people will read this one than the last one because it looks like a dead thing. Get out a nice attractive pamphlet with the main rights a farmer has, his main concerns and make them available at the elevator and you will get something done.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think, Mr. Argue, you will find on your table just such a compilation as you are talking about.

The WITNESS: We have it available and it is sought to get the widest distribution.

The CHAIRMAN: Any more questions on the overage?

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. I would like to ask Mr. McKenzie if an elevator agent was crooked, who do you think he would steal from—himself or the elevator company?—

A. Well, that is a pure supposition. I do not like to think that any elevator agent is deliberately crooked.

Q. But I say if he was, who do you think he would steal from—himself or the elevator company?—A. I would say this without a moment's hesitation, if the company knew he was stealing, he would lose the job so fast he would not know what happened because he would kill the company's business at that point.

Mr. HETLAND: I wanted to say that on account of Mr. Argue's statement about the crooked companies.

Mr. ARGUE: I cited one instance.

Mr. HETLAND: It was very unfair to bring it up here.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Fair mentioned his brother which makes two instances.

Mr. FAIR: I also mentioned that my brother did not fall into the trap.

Mr. ARGUE: This chap did not either; he is not with that company.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. McKenzie now will deal with terminal overages while we are discussing overages.

The WITNESS: Any questions you care to ask?

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you going to make a statement about terminal overages or not?—A. I think it might be well, gentlemen, if you turned over to page 12 and we might clean up this overage question while it is fresh in your minds and I will read to you the paragraph that is there:

AUDIT OF STOCKS—TERMINAL AND EASTERN ELEVATORS

In accordance with the provisions of Section 138 and 138 (a) of The Canada Grain Act, 29 terminal and 26 licensed Eastern Elevators were weighed over during the 1950-51 crop year.

Large carry-over stocks at the Lakehead and country points, coupled with a shortage of lake vessel tonnage for grain transport, created a congested terminal storage situation early in the 1951-52 crop season. Under these conditions, weighovers became long costly operations for the Board and further tied up cars on track awaiting unload.

To remove a possible traffic slow-down threat, the Board were empowered by Order in Council P.C. 5122 of September 26, 1951, to defer the weighover of any terminal elevator until such time as the weighover was considered possible or practical having regard to transportation difficulties.

It was subsequently found necessary however, to defer the weighover of only one terminal elevator at the Lakehead.

The audits of two licensed Eastern elevators indicated an accumulation of grain overages as defined by Section 138 (a) of the Canada Grain Act. The value of overages disclosed amounting to \$3,285.05 was paid to the Board by the elevator licensees concerned.

Now, that brings in the question of terminal elevators and we would be glad to give you any information we can or that you might desire. Incidentally, in those documents that we will provide you with you will find the statistics for these two.

By Mr. Argue:

Q. Would you explain to me the reason why the accounts of terminal elevators are kept in such a way that the shortage that results from artificial drying is not shown on their books?—A. Do you mind, Mr. Chairman, if I ask our statistician, Mr. Calder, to deal with that particular question.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Calder.

Mr. CALDER: Would you repeat your question?

Mr. ARGUE: Why are the books of terminal elevators kept in such a way that shortages resulting from artificial drying are not shown on the books of the company? I have a return in the House and it gives me that information.

Mr. CALDER: I am not answerable for the company's records but the registration branch show the drying loss for all elevator companies.

Mr. ARGUE: Would you mind me reading the question and the answer:

Q. What was the total reduction of various grains shown in the records of each elevator company in its terminal elevators as a result of drying?—A. Elevators took stocks which justified them in drying lines through the excellent samples that were received covering the quantities of damp and tough grain to be dried and through the registration of the new warehouse receipts for the amount of dry grain in accordance with the Board's regulation 15.6 (g).

Then, there is no information, at least none has been published so that the producer knows what those shortages are.

Mr. CALDER: The information could be made available. It is not generally published. There has been no general interest in the drying loss. The formula is set out in the board's regulations.

Mr. ARGUE: Because we have not had any great problem that way for many years but it is a big problem now and I would say that the interest is quite general and it would be well to have that information published in the annual report so that when questions are asked the answers are available.

Mr. WRIGHT: With regard to natural drying, last fall there was a lot of grain threshed as 4 tough with about a 15 per cent moisture content. This year the rest of the fields were threshed and graded No. 5 dry usually about 11 per cent moisture.

Now, somewhere in the process of getting that grain to the consumers it would seem to be good business that there would be natural drying take place through the mixing of that 5 dry and the 4 tough. If the farmer had kept the 4 tough on his farm he could have mixed it as he took it to the elevator and got a 4 straight on it because the 5 was 5 all along because of the low moisture content resulting in low weight loss per bushel.

Now, I have no doubt that somewhere in the process of getting that grain to the consumers or before it goes on the boat at the head of the lakes that takes place. Have you any information on how much of that has been done or how much can be done or who gets the benefit of it? I am particularly interested that the producer should get some of the benefit out of this natural drying.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think, Mr. Wright coming from the part of Canada that you do you are well acquainted with the fact that we do not guarantee the grades nor weights in a country elevator. Your mixing could be done in a country elevator where much of it is done and finds itself in the terminal and through the grain inspection at Winnipeg or the head of the lakes where it finds its primary grade. It is not graded. It was bought from the farmer and bought on agreement with the farmer because, as the chief pointed out to you, what is in the Act provides for the farmer if he has any disagreement with the buyer he can come to us but we have no control of the mixing that takes place in a country elevator—none whatever.

Mr. WRIGHT: There is nothing in the Act at present that says that a country elevator may not do all the mixing they want?

Mr. VALLANCE: We cannot because we do not guarantee grades. We do not say to them "This is No. 1, 2, 3, or 4"; they may buy it on the standard that we have set but it is not our grading; it is their grades and their weighing and until it gets to the primary inspection of Mr. Dollery, we recommend no grade. Isn't that right, Mr. Dollery?

Mr. DOLLERY: Except on storage.

Mr. VALLANCE: Well, this mixing might take place at a country elevator. Is there no mixing takes place when it comes to your terminal elevators? It seems to me that a lot of this grain went out of country elevators last fall as tough and a lot of the straight grade is going out now and it would seem to me to be good business to get the best grade to the consumer which would be a mixture. Now, what has taken place in the terminal elevators with regard to this? Have you any information with regard to that?

Mr. VALLANCE: What I would suggest to the committee is: Mr. Calder, who was once a statistician and is now secretary of the board, is well acquainted with all the operations of the terminals and so am I, but I think I will ask Mr. Calder, with Mr. McKenzie's permission, to just tell you what actually takes place in a terminal elevator.

Mr. CALDER: Section 125(2) of the Canada Grain Act, applies definite prohibitions on the mixing of the first four statutory grades in Schedule One of the Act and No. 1 C.W. Garnet and No. 2 C.W. Garnet by semi-public and private terminals. In a public elevator there are prohibitions on the mixing of any grade of grain. All grain must be separately binned.

Mr. WRIGHT: You are telling me there is no mixing?

Mr. CALDER: I would refer you to section 125(2), which reads:

(2) All western wheat received into any licensed semi-public or private terminal elevator and graded into any of the four grades first specified in schedule one to this Act, or graded into the grades of No. 1 C.W. Garnet or No. 2 C.W. Garnet specified in the said schedule, shall be binned with grain of the same grade and not otherwise.

Mr. WRIGHT: Has your experience been that there has been no mixing of 5 wheat with the statutory grades?

Mr. VALLANCE: No.

Mr. CALDER: There is a check on that by regular weighover audits carried out by the Board.

Mr. WRIGHT: Would it not be a good thing if it could be done in a case such as we have this year?

The WITNESS: No, you would destroy the reputation of our standard grades.

Right Hon. Mr. Howe: A lot of people used to think so till Mr. Motherwell came along. Mr. Motherwell decided otherwise.

Mr. ARGUE: Is No. 2 tough a statutory grade?

Mr. VALLANCE: Yes.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. The same thing would apply in regard to No. 3 tough last year, and No. 4 straight this spring?—A. Not No. 4.

Q. It just happens that I am acquainted with the 4 and 5 grades because that is the condition existing in the area I represent, but I am sure that the condition must exist in other places where No. 3 tough was threshed last fall and No. 4 dry this spring. Is it possible in the terminal elevators to mix those two grades?

Mr. CALDER: No. The first four statutory grades run from No. 1 hard to No. 3 northern, and No. 1 and No. 2 C.W. Garnet are also non-mixing grades.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Well, then you can mix the 4 and 5 but you cannot mix 4 and 3?—
A. That is right.

Q. You could mix the 4 and 5?—A. That is right.

Q. Has that been done in the terminal elevators?

Mr. CALDER: No. 4 northern and No. 5 wheat may be mixed in a semi-public terminal.

The WITNESS: There may be some of this mixture but the extent is revealed in our audit.

Mr. MILNER: What is the point in connection with it? Do you think it is desirable or undesirable?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, I think it is, in fact in the case of No. 5 straight that mixing gives you a straight 4 grade.

Mr. MILNER: No, it might not at all.

Mr. WRIGHT: It might, too. In fact it did in our own case on our own farm where we happen to have it.

Mr. MILNER: It was a very good five.

Mr. VALLANCE: If you had a top 4 and a top 5 and you mixed the two together, you would get out of it a fair average 4. As a farmer I agree with you.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is the point. What I was interested in was that I am sure that if the farmer is smart enough to do it on his own farm, some of the grain trade are going to be smart enough to do it before they finally sell that wheat, and I am interested in seeing that when that mixing takes place the benefit from it comes back to the producer in some form.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions with regard to overages?

Mr. FAIR: I wonder if Mr. McKenzie would explain to the committee why overages in terminal elevators are turned over to the government, while in the country elevators they are the property of the company.

The WITNESS: If you can tell me why you wrote that into the Act some years ago, section 138; that is the explanation as far as the terminals are concerned. There is no similar provision in the Act for country elevators, and I can only repeat what was said before, that that would not prove effective in country elevators.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I think the answer is that there was no compulsory pooling in those days. It would not be fair to return it to the pool unless there was compulsory pooling.

Mr. QUELCH: Would there be any justification now in turning over the overages in the terminal elevators to the Wheat Board instead of the Board of Grain Commissioners?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I think it will be all right.

Mr. FAIR: Will you see that it is done, then?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Parliament writes the Act. We do not.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that you may overemphasize the benefits that might accrue to the producer if that was done. The value of the grades we confiscated under section 138 of the Act was \$2,385.

Mr. QUELCH: That is just two elevators only.

The WITNESS: Yes, I see that, eastern elevators, that is right. The actual value of the grain confiscated is not large because if you will read section 138 we have to set off against the overages the shortages in those grades, and the balance is all that we can confiscate.

Mr. VALLANCE: I wonder if the committee is clear on that section 138. You may have no actual wheat weighed overage, but in the handling of your various grades you may find that you have more No. 1 going out than you took in and you would correspondingly have a lesser amount of No. 2 or No. 3, or whatever it was, so all you do is merely adjust your stocks and the excess in value is that amount which is set out there for eastern elevators. There is no overage in grain, there is an overage in the manipulation—and I should not use that term—there is an overage in value because they raise the grade of 3 maybe up to 2, or 2 up to 1, and the number of bushels, the value moved into the higher grade after it has been levelled off—that is the excess the Board of Grain Commissioners take from the elevators, either terminal or country.

Mr. QUELCH: Could we have the net profits from the sale of overages?

Mr. CALDER: Moneys recovered for the crown which was reported amounted to only \$3,285.05. There were no overages collected from publics, semi-publics or privates under section 138 of the Act, but there was this amount of \$3,285.05 collected on account of eastern elevators by virtue of section 138-A as indicated in the annual report of the Board.

Mr. ARGUE: If section 138 had applied to country elevator overages in roughly the same way, would you give the committee some idea of the amount of money that would be involved in that?

Mr. VALLANCE: I think, Mr. Argue, the previous statement that was made—if you apply the yardstick of section 138 to a country elevator and laid down the $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent that you allow in the terminal elevator, that your overages would be greater than they are now without it being there. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent would give them greater overall overages than they are now getting.

Mr. ARGUE: You mean they would show a greater overage than they now show?

Mr. VALLANCE: It would actually be there because you are giving them the $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent they are not now getting.

Mr. ARGUE: I do not follow your statement.

Mr. WRIGHT: $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent is actually deducted from the farmer when he is delivering his grain—he does not get paid for that amount?

Mr. VALLANCE: $\frac{3}{8}$ of 1 per cent of deliveries is deducted from his gross weights, that is right, but then if you are weighing him over under section 138 you give him what he has plus $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent of what he took in.

Mr. ARGUE: So he would show less overage?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr. VALLANCE: Anyway, we will leave that thought with you fellows and you can think it over before we finish tonight, "which I hope we will", said he, smiling. Think it over.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we pass on now to Inspection of Grain on page 7 of the report?

The WITNESS:

INSPECTION OF GRAIN

The major problem in the grading of the 1951 Western crop was occasioned by the high outturn percentage of tough and damp grain, accompanied by sprouting and mildew resulting from unfavourable harvesting conditions.

In collaboration with the Grain Research Laboratory, special studies were undertaken to determine the effect of sprouting and mildew in the baking quality of flour.

An increase in the presence of ergot has been noted in all grains for the last two crop seasons. A recommendation for further research and publicity in ergot control was made to the Federal Department of Agriculture.

Extensive use of inspection services was made by producers and elevator companies during the Fall, in the submission of two-pound samples for grading.

The excessive moisture content of grain received at terminal elevators has required the maintenance of additional inspection crews to supervise drying operations. Milling tests were run by the Grain Research Laboratory to ensure against damage to the milling and baking quality of the grain in the drying process.

Now, gentlemen, if you want any detailed information about the grading, I suggest you ask or direct your inquiries to Mr. Dollery, our chief grain inspector.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions with respect to this clause, Inspection of Grain?

Mr. FAIR: Might I ask whether there has been much deterioration in the baking quality of the grain because of artificial drying?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FAIR: That is good news, Mr. Howe.

The CHAIRMAN: That answer was short!

Mr. HETLAND: I think it would be a good idea if someone would tell this committee how your standards are set up. I understand quite a large group sets the standards.

Mr. DOLLERY: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. The setting of the standards annually in the western division is a very important undertaking and takes considerable time. Now, I will just take the highlights as to how I arrive at the standards to submit to the western committee on grain standards. In the course of shipment from the country elevators to the terminals, I procure two-bushel bags of what I think represents a damage or otherwise of the current crop. These two-bushel bags are taken at the terminal at the time of unloading of the box cars and sent by express to the Winnipeg inspection office. On arrival at Winnipeg, these two-bushel bags are tabulated and tagged. They are cleaned in the inspection office and a portion is submitted to Dr. Anderson for protein tests and when I get these results back that information is all placed on the ticket. When I have full information on the crop damages, such as frost and green and sprouting, and so on, I proceed to make up my standards. Invariably I mix up about 16 bags of each grade because those standards go to every country in the world this side of the iron curtain at the present time. That takes in trade commissioners, milling and baking interests, and the exporters overseas, the chief cereal chemist at Ottawa, trade commissioners, and anyone else who desires it. I have even sent numerous parcels of the samples to the farmer union organizations upon request. When these samples are all prepared, in co-operation with the chief chemist, Dr. Anderson, I notify my board.

Mr. HETLAND: Would you tell me the personnel of that board?

The CHAIRMAN: They are listed in this report.

Mr. HETLAND: I want to get that list on the record. Whom do they represent—that is what I wanted to get at.

Mr. DOLLERY: The Committee on Western Grain Standards, 1951, is composed as follows:

D. G. McKenzie, Chief Commissioner, Board of Grain Commissioners

J. Vallance, Commissioner, Board of Grain Commissioners

R. W. Milner, Commissioner, Board of Grain Commissioners

A. F. Dollery, Chief Grain Inspector, Board of Grain Commissioners

J. Forsyth, Chairman, Grain Appeal Tribunal, Winnipeg

C. R. Manahan, Chairman, Grain Appeal Tribunal, Edmonton

P. J. Marples, Chairman, Grain Appeal Tribunal, Calgary

Dr. J. A. Anderson, Chief Chemist, Dominion Grain Research Laboratory
 Dr. C. H. Goulden, Dominion Cerealist
 W. A. Hastings, representing the millers of wheat flour

George Bennett	}	Representing grain growers in Alberta
W. H. Fairfield		
R. H. MacDonald		
B. S. Plumer		

A. F. Sproule	}	Representing grain growers in Saskatchewan
A. P. Gleave		
J. Wellbelove		
L. L. Gray		
G. S. Canfield		

W. J. Parker	}	Representing grain growers in Manitoba
R. Barrett		
Ray Mitchell		

G. Constable, representing grain growers in British Columbia
 Nelson Young, representing Plant Products Division, Department of Agriculture

Mr. VALLANCE: I think you better read into the record section 25 of the Act giving us the power to do what has been done in appointing these people.

The CHAIRMAN: You just read the names of the Committee on Western Grain Standards, and I see there is another group.

Mr. DOLLERY: Shall I proceed, Mr. Chairman, with the authorization?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. DOLLERY: This section 25 of the Canada Grain Act reads as follows:

25. The Board shall before the first day of July in each year cause to be constituted a Committee on Western Grain Standards and a Committee on Eastern Grain Standards (hereinafter referred to as the "Western Committee" and the "Eastern Committee"), which Committees shall respectively have jurisdiction to select and settle the standard samples to be used in the crop year commencing on the first day of August following in connection with the grading of western grain and of other grain.

(2) The commissioners, the chief grain inspector, the chairmen of the grain appeal tribunals hereafter referred to, the chief chemist on the staff of the Board and the Dominion cerealist shall be *ex-officio* members of the Western Committee, and the Board shall nominate or arrange for the nomination as members, from among persons who are willing and able to act, of a representative of millers of wheat flour and of four representatives of the grain growers in Alberta, five of the grain growers in Saskatchewan, three of the grain growers in Manitoba, one of the grain growers in British Columbia and of a representative of the Plant Products Division of the Department of Agriculture of Canada...

Mr. DOLLERY: I have named those representatives, gentlemen and Mr. Chairman, for the western committee.

(3) The Commissioners and the Chief Grain Inspector shall be *ex-officio* members of the Eastern Committee and the Board shall nominate or arrange for the nomination as members of one representative of the Montreal Board of Trade, one representative of the Toronto Board of Trade, one of the persons engaged in the business

of exporting grain, two of the millers of wheat flour in the Eastern Division, two of the representatives of grain growers in Ontario and such additional persons, not exceeding three in number, one of whom shall be a representative of the corn growers, as the Board may consider advisable.

Paragraph 4—do you wish me to read that one?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think so. That is the information you wanted, Mr. Hetland?

Mr. DOLLERY: I will read to you, Mr. Chairman, if you wish the members of the eastern committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless the eastern members would like to have it on the record.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: You will find it on page 29 of the report.

Mr. QUELCH: I would like to ask a question in regard to the method of shipping and grading wheat that is supposed to take place. It always seems to me a somewhat haphazard method. Take the case where a rush season is on and farmers are hauling maybe 30 or 40 truck loads a day and from each load a sample is placed in a box and then the sample from that box is sent. Now, is that box locked all the time or is it supposed to be open? As a rule they usually leave it open on a shelf. If they lock them who gets the key, the farmer?

Mr. VALLANCE: The farmer gets the key of the box and the operator of the elevator must have a cabinet in which the box must be kept and for which the operator holds the key, the theory behind it being that the farmer cannot get into the box to tamper with it as long as the operator has the key to the cabinet and the operator cannot get into the farmer's box as long as the farmer holds the key to the box.

Mr. QUELCH: That is a right that the farmer should exercise?

Mr. VALLANCE: Yes.

And it also depends, I think, as to what type of ticket the farmer is expecting when he sells his grain. If he is putting it into a special bin, the procedure you are talking about takes place but if they agree to take the grade storage ticket and they agree on the grade, the farmer and the operator of the elevator then, that is all the farmer is entitled to—so much grain of a certain kind and grade and if at any time he wants to repurchase it he can but I think there is another way that can be made straight here. There is, I think, a misunderstanding always amongst the farmers. They believe that the elevator operator must in all cases buy the grain. That is not so but he must take it into store if he has a space for it and it is in a storable condition but he does not have to buy the farmer's grain. I am not saying he does not always buy it.

Mr. QUELCH: I was not thinking of special bins so much as grade storage.

Mr. VALLANCE: If the farmer is, as you say taking a special bin, he is usually taking it for storage but if he takes it for grade storage, it is sent down to Mr. Dollery and he grades it and he must have that grade delivered to him any time he wants it.

Mr. FAIR: I think there is another point there, Mr. Chairman, which might be emphasized and that is in many cases where the farmer is not satisfied with the grade he tells the agent that he is not satisfied and the agent sends a grade to his own company and then it is supposed to be sent direct to the Chief Grain Inspector and that is not being done in many, many cases and I think if that information could be publicized I think it would clear up a lot of dissatisfaction.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think Mr. Dollery would like to see some of that.

Mr. FERRIE: Maybe you would give us the information while you are on your feet why the grades change from the fall to the spring, why they will ease up in the spring of the year. You say that certain grades are made. You will agree that certain grades are made. For years it has been the practice that there is an easing up of grades when it comes to the spring of the year. What is the reason for that and how does it happen?

Mr. DOLLERY: That is a different question but I would like to answer Mr. Fair first and your question was what Mr. Fair?

Mr. FAIR: That in many cases—I do not say in all cases—but in many cases an elevator agent sends the grain to his company's office in Edmonton, Saskatoon or whoever it may be. I believe it should be sent in cases of dispute to the Chief Grain Inspector.

Mr. DOLLERY: At Winnipeg or under my name in Calgary or Edmonton.

Now, the information in regard to the procedure on that is in regulation 18 of the board's book of regulations. I would like to read chapter 12, Mr. Chairman:

Special Bin or Subject to Grade and Dockage Grain or where there is Disagreement as to Grade and Dockage

12. The elevator receipt or receipts issued where there is a disagreement as to grade and dockage or where grain has been received subject to inspector's grade and dockage must have incorporated thereon at the time of issue the grade offered to the owner of the grain by the manager or operator of the elevator.

Now, in 13—this is quite lengthy, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, is it too long?

Mr. DOLLERY: I can tell you in my own words.

The CHAIRMAN: I think if you answered Mr. Fair in your own words, Mr. Dollery, it would be sufficient.

Mr. DOLLERY: Well, Mr. Fair and Mr. Chairman you spoke of the paper samples being sent to the grain inspectors. We never see those samples. Probably at the beginning of the crop year some of those grain inspectors do bring some samples up and I appreciate it for our grading, not our official grading but as a confirmation of what they are doing so that they can advise their agents but any samples sent in to the grain firms marked "subject to grade and dockage" we never see them.

Mr. FAIR: That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. DOLLERY: It is contrary to the Board of Grain Commissioners' regulations. You mentioned your elevator boxes having a lock. That is in the board's regulations. The farmer is supposed to supply the lock and the elevator company the box and the farmer is supposed to keep the key of that box.

Mr. FAIR: That applies in all cases of special graded storage?

Mr. DOLLERY: Yes. But I have some figures here after a while if you want them on two pound samples subject to grade and dockage submitted from western points.

Now, every time we have spoken to farmers, as Mr. McKenzie mentioned, we find out in the country—Mr. Jutras I think will bear this out; we were out in Manitoba and we had a very nice reception, by the way, and we always impress on the farmers their privileges under the Board of Grain Commissioners' regulations that they can and they do send two pound samples subject to grade and dockage. I have had samples sent in in a small match box by farmers asking for grading. That is ridiculous. We have to have two pounds

to establish our grade and dockage and moisture test. And part of that sample has to be included in an air tight container. If it was not it would dry out.

Now, that business of the inspection department is increasing all the time and the farmers are getting to know more about what they should do in the case of a disagreement between the agent and the farmer and send these samples in for grade and dockage. Our samples are increasing in that respect and we stress that at every opportunity, at every meeting of the pools of the farmers or whoever requests us to speak to gatherings and the Canada Grain Act, we stress that point and to send those two pound samples. Does that answer your question?

Mr. FAIR: I am not disagreeing with the regulations of the Board of Grain Commissioners. I simply wanted to bring out those points of disagreement and dissatisfaction in some cases. I agree as to principle but there are so many people who do not know and if they had the information they would do it.

Mr. DOLLERY: Well, every sample after we grade it we send it back to the farmer and he is issued with an official ticket.

Mr. FAIR: I have sent several samples in myself for grading.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Can you answer Mr. Ferrie's question?

Mr. WRIGHT: That there is an easing of grades in the spring, I think is the question.

Mr. FERRIE: The one I asked you as to why the grades change and ease up from fall to spring.

Mr. DOLLERY: Who eases up in the spring?

Mr. FERRIE: Well, every department that you have. We have had grades in the fall and sent them in to you and in the spring of the year they nearly always drop and the farmer is thinking: "This will gain a grade if I keep it until spring." Often it does. The reason I asked you is that they do that. If you take that sample in the fall, test it and carry it through until the end of the crop year.

Mr. DOLLERY: That is not so. We do not ease up or tighten up on our grading once the standards are set and we do not tighten up or ease up on our statutory standards. They are set by the Dominion Government as a statute of Canada and the commercial grades are set up, the western committee has grade standards on 5 and 6 wheat, export and standard.

I make periodic trips right through that inspection area and I have never found yet where our inspectors are easing or tightening up in our grades. That is the policy. That is the policy of the inspection branch, to give the producer the break on the line car. By "line car" I mean that is a very, very good No. 5 and rock bottom for No. 4. We are giving the producer a break every time on that type of grading.

Mr. QUELCH: Now, your answer might be correct in so far as grades that are sent to you—

Mr. DOLLERY: I am talking of car inspections.

Mr. QUELCH: But so far as the farmer is concerned I know that about 99 per cent of the farmers will tell you that they find if they hold their grain over until the spring they will get a better grade. I have sold grain for 40 years and I know it. When you start sending in samples you will get a certain grade and that will ease off unless we send a sample to you.

Mr. ARGUE: That is an agreement with the local agent.

Mr. QUELCH: Yes, if the sample is sent down to the grain commissioners maybe it is not the case.

Mr. DOLLERY: Well, I cannot speak for the grain trade now. We try and co-operate fully with their inspectors and, as I say, they are very, very

fair. They go out at the beginning of the crop year and usually send in samples, hundreds a day so we can get a clear picture of this whole western crop and if there is any particular type of damage we can immediately get a five pound or ten pound sample and submit it to Dr. Anderson to find out the extent of the damage but if there is any tightening up in the spring or a slackening off I am not responsible for what the country agents do or their inspectors.

If anyone can cite me a case where they have sent a sample in to the inspection branch and show where we have tightened up in the spring or fall I want to know about it.

Mr. ROSS: There is a variation from year to year, though, you set your standards each year. They may vary.

Mr. DOLLERY: Commercial grades yes, but the definition in the statutory grades is set by you gentlemen in Ottawa. I have to live up to that. Now, the interpretation of these definitions, that is another matter but every standard is set and is passed by the western Grain Standards committee according to those definitions.

Mr. QUELCH: What are the regulations regarding the use of annexes? There is a certain practice that is very general—it is by no means an unusual one—where in the rush season the elevator starts to open up its annex and then it declares that the only grain it is putting in the annex is, we will say, 3 tough. I remember one year the only grain that could be put in that annex was 3 tough and the elevator will say: "We will take from you 3 tough. If you have no 3 tough we do not want the grain." Surely they could divide the annexes up so they could take a number of grades instead of taking just one. That is general practice and it is bitterly resented.

Mr. MILNER: Well, competition should surely take care of that.

Mr. QUELCH: It does not take care of it at all because other elevators will probably be full. They only put it in the annex when the other elevator is full. It is becoming general practice. I am sure any farmer here who sells grain will tell you that is the case in general.

Mr. ROSS: It has been the general practice the last few years especially. If you do not take that grade they won't handle it.

Mr. QUELCH: I am thinking especially of the last two years and I can also remember that practically all grain from a certain district was grade-typed, I think when we had Dr. McGibbon who admitted that the area had been zoned and all of the grain from that area was recommended as of a certain type that year and they would only take grain provided it was taken as 3 tough. That was several years ago; that is back in the 30's but as Mr. Ross said in the past two years that has been a general practice.

Mr. MILNER: But just think a moment; who would it benefit? Would it benefit the agent or the elevator company or who? It is a ridiculous assumption on the face of it.

Mr. ROSS: Well, it would benefit some farmers and not others. That would depend on the predominating grade in that particular community.

Mr. MILNER: It is not done for the sake of defrauding the farmers.

Mr. QUELCH: I do not know what the solution would be but it certainly does not benefit the farmer.

Mr. MILNER: The agent himself gets no benefit out of it, the company would get a bad reputation which will eventually put them out of business—it is a ridiculous assumption on the face of it.

Mr. QUELCH: Well, it has occurred in the last few years.

Mr. MILNER: Certainly but it was not for the purpose of defrauding the producer.

Mr. WRIGHT: The elevator agent is faced with a problem to decide just what he is going to put in that annex and he has got to use his best judgment as to the predominant grade in the community and then there are farmers who have not got that grade who need money and they accept it.

Mr. ROSS: They are the people who are stung.

Mr. WRIGHT: But the elevator agent tries to get the predominant grade in that annex.

Mr. FAIR: Mr. Chairman, that has happened also in my section of the country so there is nothing ridiculous about it; it does look a bit unfair.

Mr. MILNER: Mr. Chairman, my objection to the trend of the argument is this; let me tell you what would happen if you and I were operating a country elevator organization and we had a vacancy to get an agent. What would you and I do as keen businessmen? In that district we would go into that district and pick out the best man with the best reputation we could find in the district and whose reputation was beyond question. We would pick him for the purpose of his honesty as a man and his reflection on the honesty of the company. After that was done we would have to have him bonded—every agent has to be bonded. After he has been through this stage of having been bonded he is licensed by the Board of Grain Commissioners.

Now, you start out with a young man and a man which you and I picked for the position as an honest man.

Is it the suggestion that these country agents have become crooks overnight?

Mr. QUELCH: No, there is no suggestion of dishonesty there at all. The point is that the prevailing grade may be 3 tough, so they decide they must fill the whole annex with No. 3 tough. Now, if you are in a position where you have No. 2, you have to take 3 tough because there is no room in the annex.

Mr. MILNER: Well, if there is no room there is no blame to these operators.

Mr. QUELCH: If that annex was so divided up that they could take 70 per cent of No. 3 tough and 30 per cent of No. 2, but when they fill the elevator with the one grade they are only servicing the farmer with the 3 tough wheat, whereas they could service the farmer who holds No. 2 wheat.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think that very principle was taken into account when you built a series of bins inside the elevator to take care of the various kinds of grain coming into that elevator. What you are trying to do now is to extend that principle to the annex.

Mr. ROSS: I move that we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn till 3.15 this afternoon.

The meeting adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. Before we adjourned for lunch, we were considering the section on the inspection of grain, at the top of page 7. Are there any more questions in connection with the inspection of grain?

Mr. FAIR: There is one question, Mr. Chairman, in connection with page 12 we were discussing before, and that is the overage in two elevators, \$3,285.05. Did the other terminal elevators have their annual weighover or what happened there?

Mr. DOLLERY: They had their regular weighovers, but the deficiencies exceeded the values and the excesses, therefore there were no moneys recoverable for the crown under section 138 of the Act.

Mr. HETLAND: I was wondering whether on tough grain anything over 15.5 per cent moisture, there is a 4-cent penalty right down through. I know how difficult it is for a buyer when he gets a 15 per cent moisture grade and a 16.5 per cent moisture. Now, a farmer with a 15 per cent moisture content is usually trying to get a straight grade. It is quite a fight between the buyers. Would it be possible that with the moisture content of 15 per cent to be discounted 1 cent, and 15.5 per cent to be discounted another half a cent. It would be more irregular, I know, but there certainly would be a lot less criticism of the buyer and it would save him a lot of headaches.

The CHAIRMAN: What you are advocating, Mr. Hetland, is a graduated penalty?

Mr. HETLAND: It would be a graduated penalty, yes. I think farmers' unions are asking for something like that on page 9 of their brief. I think it would avoid a lot of discontent in the country. In fact, a man does not care how tough it is till it gets to 17 per cent moisture, which is damp, and I think there should be some incentive to lower that moisture content.

Mr. DOLLERY: The question of binning would be difficult and you would add so many more grades, say 14 more grades.

Mr. HETLAND: I realize that it would, but still one would offset the other, would it not?

Mr. D. G. McKenzie, Chief Commissioner, Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada, recalled:

The WITNESS: I would like to suggest, sir, that fixing the spread between grades is not a function of our board at all, it is a function of the Wheat Board, and I am only speaking from presumption—I presume in the determining of their spread they take into consideration the demand and marketability in those particular grades of the wheat, but if you want an explanation as to why the spread is fixed at 3, 4 or 5 cents, we cannot answer it.

Mr. HETLAND: But the man who has a 15 per cent moisture content is certainly penalized more than he should be.

The WITNESS: I appreciate that.

Mr. FERRIE: Why should there be two penalties? Why should he lose on grade and then lose on price if he has moisture?

The WITNESS: As I say, I cannot tell you anything about price, but when it comes to grade we have to specify moisture content and we say anything up to 14½ per cent is top grade and over 17 per cent is damp, and so on.

Mr. HETLAND: When we come to damp, Mr. Chairman, it is the same way. After it goes over 17 per cent it does not make any difference whether it is 20 or 22 or 25.

The WITNESS: I think we made an adjustment on anything over 20 per cent because the cost of drying grain of, say 22 per cent, is more than it is for drying grain with 19 per cent.

By Mr. Fair:

Q. What was the cost of drying per bushel of the two?—A. Well, the spread reflects that. Together with losses in weight.

Q. You said you made a break of 20 per cent moisture?—A. We did it for the reason that we felt it costs more money.

Q. It costs less to dry below 20 per cent than it does above?—A. Exactly.

Q. What is the difference in cost of drying those below 20 and above?

Mr. MILNER: The rate established was 14. A lot of that stuff had to be dried over twice.

By Mr. Ferrie:

Q. Why is it you gentlemen always give the break to the trade? Why not to the farmer? We pay you so why should we not get a break once in a while? The farmer never gets a break, it is the trade.—A. If you can find anybody in western Canada who is more jealous of the farmers' interests than John Vallance and myself—

Q. I know you two well, but it always seems that the farmers have to take the loss. If it is over the line he has got to take the breaks, as far as he is concerned he has to lose, but the trade never loses. The breaks are always made on that side. How about reversing that for a year or two?

Mr. VALLANCE: I do not know what you are considering in the break.

Mr. FERRIE: You have .4 here, a lot of it was .4 and it was close 14.5 or 6, just over the line. Does he get that break? No, he certainly does not get that break. It is damp or it is tough. If it is a very fractional part over, then he has to take the loss. Now, the grade is the same. If it is a class 3, well he does not get a 3 because it does not go into the contract. When they give him a .4 they say it is a good 4 but a poor 3. They do not give him 3. They do that right along. Now, for a year or two let us have the break. They have had the break for years and years now. Let the farmer have the break for a while.

Mr. MILNER: I do not think you ever heard of a grade such as a poor 3.

Mr. FERRIE: But that is what the elevator man says it is. He would give him a 4 on a poor 3. What I say is that when the grade is on the line the break should be given to the farmer.

Mr. MILNER: In 99 cases out of 100 competition forces that position on the elevator agent.

Mr. FERRIE: Not now, though.

Mr. MILNER: Not with the blocked position of the elevators, not now. But they are just human beings.

Mr. VALLANCE: To be fair, sections 111 and 112 of the Act should be read here. You say that the farmer does not get the break. Well, provision is made in section 111 as follows:

111. If grain is offered at any licensed public country elevator for sale or ordinary storage and the person offering the same and the operator or manager of the elevator agree as to the grade thereof, and the proper dockage therefrom, an ordinary cash purchase ticket or elevator receipt shall be issued in respect of such grain, describing it by reference to the grade and stating the dockage agreed upon.

Now I am going to read section 112, as follows:

112. If grain is offered at a licensed public country elevator for sale or ordinary storage, but the person offering the same and the

person in charge of the elevator do not agree as to the grade thereof or the proper dockage therefrom, a sample shall be taken and placed in a receptacle in such manner as may be prescribed and shall be submitted for examination under this Act as may be directed by regulation.

Mr. FERRIE: All right, now. You ought to finish that by going on to say that no elevator company shall grade a farmer's grain, that no elevator company shall have the right to make that final inspection and issue a certificate, that only the Board of Grain Commissioners shall have that right. Do that and I will agree with that.

Mr. VALLANCE: That is the only one that can do it.

Mr. FERRIE: Excuse me, but if you will stop these packages from going into the company and stop them saying this is the grade, then you will be doing something. You have the job to grade this grain. Now, let us go to work and say, all right, no company shall issue a final grade, it shall be—

Mr. VALLANCE: They do not issue.

Mr. FERRIE: Excuse me, they issue a certificate. You heard that this morning.

Mr. MILNER: No, they do not. There is no company that sends out an official certificate of its own.

Mr. QUELCH: It is a certificate, but it is not official.

Mr. MILNER: Certainly, not official.

Mr. FERRIE: Just say, then, that no packages shall be sent out and a grade sent back to the elevator company.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Ferrie, you want to be fair?

Mr. FERRIE: Yes.

Mr. VALLANCE: Suppose that you are operating an elevator and I come in with a load of wheat and you say to me "Jack, how much have you got?", and I say so much. And he says, "I will tell you what we will do. I would like the company to say whether I am prepared to give you a certain grade", and he says, "No, I do not want your company to grade it, but let us agree to send it to the Grain Board." We do not put an inspection on it until it is shipped. We do not de-weight or de-grade in a country elevator, but we do give all the inspection possible to give them in a country elevator.

Mr. FERRIE: You haven't got the point yet.

Mr. VALLANCE: You want to put it in the Act that samples for grading be not sent to the company? That the sample should only go to the Board?

Mr. FERRIE: 90 per cent of the farmers figure that is where it is going, to the Board of Grain Commissioners, and that they are getting an inspection from there, and that is their grade.

Mr. VALLANCE: The farmer has a right under the Act to stipulate an agreement with the operator of the elevator that his sample shall go to the chief grain inspector.

Mr. FERRIE: That is where he thinks it goes and it does not go.

Mr. VALLANCE: If he does not want to take the grade the elevator offers him, that is his prerogative, it is not a privilege but a right under the Act and he has an appeal to the Chief Grain Commissioner. If I went in to your elevator and we were in disagreement you might say to me, "I would like to take it up with the company", and I might agree, but I would not allow you and I would do just as you are suggesting, I would demand that he send it to the Chief Grain Inspector. I think that our friend, Mr. Wright, put his finger on the whole problem this morning when he said it is due to the lack of publicity and

knowledge given by the Board of Grain Commissioners. We have accepted every opportunity to go out into the country and explain this Act from A to Z at all times, and there is no way by which we can go out, although it is suggested in the Act that the Board of Grain Commissioners shall conduct a certain number of meetings at given places throughout the season. We have to wait till we are invited, but the farmer or the agent of any elevator, I do not care whether it is the pool or the U.G.G., knows this. It is all set out in the Act.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Mr. FAIR: That is the technical end of it, Mr. Chairman, but in practice it does not work out this way.

The WITNESS: What we can do in the Act is for the protection of the farmer, but if he does not take advantage of it we cannot help it.

Mr. FERRIE: The point I am trying to get over is that he will take advantage of it, but he is not getting it. When he goes to the elevator they grab up a few handfulls of grain out of the wagon box, they send it to the company and the company grades it and sends it back. He gets the certificate, it is not official, and that is the grade. If that thing were stopped it would all have to go to you and then there would be no misunderstanding at all. He would know that that was the right and proper grade.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to place on the record something which the chief grain commissioner handed to me. Knowledge of this the board has had before, and in order to keep the record straight I will put this information on the record. The following shows two-pound samples of grain inspected under regulation 16. 1 (g) from August 1, 1951 to May 31, 1952, inclusive.

<i>Inspection Point</i>	<i>Not Charged</i>	<i>Charged</i>	<i>Total</i>
Winnipeg	2,874	16,758	19,632
Edmonton	24	545	569
Calgary	40	890	930
Medicine Hat	nil	107	107
Lethbridge	7	1,956	1,963
Moose Jaw	36	498	534
Saskatoon	14	671	685
Total	2,995	21,425	24,420

From that you will see that 24,420 two-pound samples were sent to the chief grain inspector.

Mr. QUELCH: What is the difference between "charged" and "not charged"?

Mr. VALLANCE: I think that is a reasonable question. We find as a result of the crop condition and with the staff available to make inspections there were times when it was almost impossible to grade the cars going through and take care of the two-pound samples, and whether we were right or wrong, we decided we would try and retard the volume that was coming in by putting a charge of \$2 on it. Whether we were successful or not, or whether we were wrong, the staff was not available to do the inspection, and that is the reason for this.

Mr. BRYCE: What charge do you make?

Mr. VALLANCE: Two pounds, \$1.

Mr. JUTRAS: \$1 for each two-pound sample?

Mr. VALLANCE: Yes.

Mr. HETLAND: Wouldn't that be rather high?

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman, do not get away from the fact that the cost of inspecting a two-pound sample is just as much to us as the cost of inspecting a carload, less the cost of drawing the sample out of a car.

Mr. HETLAND: Just as expensive?

Mr. VALLANCE: Yes.

Mr. HETLAND: Why?

Mr. VALLANCE: The inspection work requires the same clerical assistance, and Mr. Dollery estimates that it costs his staff as much in labour to get out the reports.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. It is an expense?—A. Yes.

Q. Why?—A. The same clerical work, the same inspectional work. Mr. Dollery can tell you that it costs his staff as much in time and labour to inspect a two-pound sample as it does a sample drawn from a carload for which we get \$2. It is \$1 there because he pays for the cost of sampling there. In this case we do not need the sample so we pay the cost at \$1.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on inspection of grain.

Mr. HETLAND: I have one. Now Mr. Vallance—I think I might be wrong in this—but I got the impression that he thought that taking the overages from the country elevators would not work out. Is that what you said?

Mr. VALLANCE: No, I do not know. I have an open mind as to what we can do with the overages in a country elevator but as it now stands we have no power to take the overages in a country elevator.

Mr. FAIR: That is all right. An amendment could be possibly put to this legislation to take these overages.

Mr. VALLANCE: I am not here to suggest to your committee just what amendments are necessary to bring home what you desire. I would rather suspect, Mr. Chairman, if I have any knowledge at all of parliamentary committees, that from the evidence submitted the committee will arrive at decisions or conclusions from which they will make recommendations to the minister for amendments to the Canada Grain Act.

Now, as was pointed out to you this morning, section 138 cannot apply in a country elevator. We might as well get that out and what would have to be done would be some method devised now that is not in the Act which would permit us, if it is desirable, it should be done, to take these overages from the country elevators.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I might say the department looked at the situation pretty thoroughly. We thought when we started it would be easy to do what you suggest. The more we studied the problem the more pitfalls we found. We have come strongly to the conclusion that a regulation of that kind is something which I do not think this committee would want to go into today. If they want to study it next year and hear evidence on it, it might be worth doing but strangely enough there was not any particular resistance in the trade towards the idea. The trade is just as anxious to have this service as we are.

Mr. HETLAND: Would it be possible to get some of these pitfalls before the committee sometime so we would know why it would not work?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I think certain briefs could be presented now but I do not think we would have time to go into the question. If it were on the agenda for the next session we could expect to have more time. The Saskatchewan elections took so many members away it delayed the Committee four or five weeks this year.

I was hoping we would make the study this year but there is not time to do it now and I suggest that this matter of overages in country elevators be put over to next year and that we take plenty of time to consider it.

Mr. FAIR: I think that is very satisfactory.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I had an idea on it myself as you had but I think it would be very effective to do nothing at all yet.

Mr. FAIR: I think we should delve right into it and consider the thing on a sound basis. Perhaps we can do that next session.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Yes, and I would be very glad to arrange it.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions under inspection of grain? Shall we move on to storage of foreign grain for reshipment from Canada?

The WITNESS: I wonder if I may crave your indulgence for just a moment? We have been discussing the inspection of grain primarily from the viewpoint of the interest of the producer in the primary inspection. The other end of that equation, if you like, is equally important, that of satisfying the foreign purchaser of our grain and I would like to put on record, if I may, sir, an opinion expressed in a copy of the report of the Canadian Grain Mission.

That Mission was made up of Mr. Milner, Mr. Laurie and Dr. C. F. Wilson who went over to the old country a year ago last fall. This is what I would like to read about the opinion of foreign buyers in respect of the character and quality of the inspection of Canadian grain. Any of you that are interested in this—I do not know whether copies are available but it is worth reading. These two paragraphs I would like to read:

The wheat importers and the millers acknowledge the reliability of Canada's statutory wheat grades and consider them entirely satisfactory. As buyers of Canadian wheat they consider the Canadian grading system superior to the grading systems of other wheat exporting countries. They had no improvements to suggest, nor did they consider that any changes were required. One feature they appreciate is that the statutory grades are constant from year to year. It was stressed by some of the importers that the lack of infestation and the cleanliness of Canadian wheat are characteristics of considerable importance to buyers, and ones that are not sufficiently publicized by Canada. Any publicity in the future that may be contemplated in furthering the sale of Canadian wheat might usefully stress this feature.

No complaints were received that shipments were below the export official standards. In fact, one important group of wheat importers stated that the cargoes received were consistently better than the export standard samples. The chief complaint heard was directed at the variation in strengths within the grades, particularly in wheat shipped from Vancouver. The European buyer would prefer standardization rather than the variance of quality within the grade, since such variation makes difficult the processing of a uniform product. Because wheat shipped through Vancouver, due to climatic and soil conditions, lacks the uniformity of wheat exported through Eastern ports, no opportunity should be lost to effect improvements in variety and quality.

Those are the paragraphs I thought might interest you and I just want to add this, that I was over in Britain three or four years ago with the then secretary of our board, Mr. John Raynor and we met all the harbour boards of Britain—I think seven of them if I remember rightly. We discussed this question fully with them. There were two complaints on Canadian grain and they said to us: "Whatever you do, protect the quality of your export wheat from Canada. We take your certificate final as equal to the gold standard of any

country in the world." I think that is really a tribute to the Canadian inspection and it is one we have got to guard very jealously and that is exactly what we are trying to do in the administration of the Canada Grain Act.

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. It is dry wheat in which the other nations insist upon—14·5 being the recognized standards?—A. That is the recognized standard. The Wheat Board could tell you that occasionally they did export some tough wheat.

Q. Would the importing nations accept a greater moisture content than 14·5?—A. I do not think it would be safe to try it. If you are moving wheat over there in hot weather and it goes out of condition you spoil the reputation of the Canadian industry.

By Mr. Bryce:

Q. I saw the unloading of the grain in different ports of Britain and I asked them about it and they said it would not do to have more moisture than 14 but the moment they get it abroad more moisture can be added once they get it there but if you carry it in bags it will go all right with 17 per cent or 20 per cent but not the way we ship it.

One thing they do ask you if you go to these different ports is: "What would you grade the wheat?" I was the wrong man to ask because I am not an expert on wheat but looking at the wheat that they were showing me and compared to what you get from the wagon load back home, I do not think the grades were the same. I am telling you I do not know a thing about wheat but as a layman I think a No. 1 at our local elevator has got to be an awful lot better than the No. 1 that arrives in Britain.—A. Some of the bloom might be off the wheat because of the handling but I read you the opinion of the people that buy our wheat ascertained by the mission of which Mr. Milner was a member.

Q. I do not doubt it. I will read that very carefully after I get a copy.

Mr. MILNER: As a matter of fact, the export standard is higher than the standard in your terminal elevators.

Mr. VALLANCE: Seventy-five per cent of the average of the grade and 25 per cent of the minimum so that your outgoing standard as Commissioner Milner says is always higher than your ingoing standard.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. We would take a loss then?—A. There is no loss in it.

Q. Why not?—A. If there is any loss the terminals take it.

Q. The terminals take the loss if any?—A. Yes.

Q. That brings up one more question. When an importer actually orders a cargo of wheat can they do their own mixing by asking for so many grades to be put in that cargo?

Mr. MILNER: You mean in the same hold?

Mr. HETLAND: Yes.

Mr. MILNER: No, it is put in with separations.

Mr. HETLAND: You mean they cannot order No. 1, 2 and 4 and get the benefit of mixing them?

Mr. MILNER: The chief inspector would grade it as "sample spring wheat mixed".

The WITNESS: We would not let any such mixture as that go out.

Mr. MILNER: It could not go out under our certificate final and the identity of the grain not protected.

The WITNESS: Once they get it over there they can mix it but it is their own standard.

Mr. MILNER: Your question whether 14.5 could be shipped for straight grades—I think it could not be because they would not get a certificate final with it.

Mr. QUELCH: Is that an insistence on their part?

Mr. MILNER: It is an insistence on our part to maintain the quality of our wheat.

Mr. VALLANCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have only one little thing to say about the raising of it to 15. I think it is common knowledge in this committee—I was a member of this House for many years and in the records of this committee on Agriculture and Colonization there was at one time and it is in the report that it is stressed, a belief from a certain portion of Canada on that point you have suggested, Mr. Fair, about it being brought about that we increase the moisture content to 15 per cent.

Mr. FAIR: I did not say a word about that.

Mr. VALLANCE: Whoever it was anyway. Anyhow, it was said but it is right in the record of this committee and there was a previous investigation into it and we just found that it was not possible for several reasons and I think from a sales standpoint your importer does not want to buy that type of wheat.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we go on to storage of foreign grain for reshipment to Canada? Is that agreed?

Agreed.

The WITNESS:

STORAGE OF FOREIGN GRAIN FOR RE-SHIPMENT FROM CANADA

Under authority of Section 15 (cc) of The Canada Grain Act, the Board during 1951 restricted the entry of foreign grain into Canada for export to give priority to the storage of Canadian grain. With the exception of permits issued for the Pacific Coast to one of the terminal elevators without country feeders, the flow of foreign grain into Canada was shut off early in the season before the Fall movement of the Canadian grain crop got under way.

During the 1951 calendar year, 20,567,313 bushels of foreign grain entered Canada for re-export under permits granted by the Board. By the close of the year, only 261,940 bushels of foreign grain remained in Canadian elevator storage—217,289 bushels on the Pacific Coast, and 44,651 bushels in Eastern position.

I think that the page itself is self-explanatory. Under the authority given to us under section 15 (cc) of the Canada Grain Act we refuse to issue permits for the storage of foreign grain or United States grain mostly in Canada in order to make sure that the storage facilities in this country would be available for the storage of Canadian grain.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would the foreign grain chiefly be American grain?—A. Mostly American grain.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions on this section?

Carried.

Weighing of grain?

The WITNESS:

WEIGHING OF GRAIN

The Board were concerned over the considerable number of unsatisfactory lake vessel outturns at Eastern elevators which were investigated during the 1951 season of navigation.

In addition to the regular more routine checks on weighing of the cargoes at loading and unloading houses, special audits of terminal elevator stocks were carried out in connection with the reported appreciable outturn shortages in two lake vessel cargoes. Adjustment of liability for excessive outturn shortages for a number of cargoes are awaiting the completion of Eastern elevator weighovers.

On the whole, however, lake vessel cargo outturns have been fairly satisfactory.

Through the courtesy of a Scale Company in Montreal, arrangements have been made to give selected personnel of Weighing Branch, shop experience and training in the mechanics of large hopper scale operation, adjustment and repair.

Now, Mr. Capon, the chief weighman is here and if you have any questions you desire to put to him I am sure he would be glad to give you such information as he can.

Mr. WRIGHT: Are these shortages mostly in coarse grain or in wheat?

Mr. CAPON: No, this is in various grains.

Mr. WRIGHT: Who is liable for the losses incurred? Is it the skipper, the Wheat Board or who?

Mr. CAPON: No, the certificate final plan of export grain is issued at Fort William and the shippers ensure their cargo with out-of-turn insurance companies, the majority of shippers.

Mr. HETLAND: Do you know of any reason why these two cargoes were short?

Mr. CAPON: Investigation was made at the elevators and no cause was found why these vessels should be short. However, there were some cargoes where we found grain in tanks in the vessel. They were adjusted but they are awaiting final settlement when annual weigh-over of some eastern elevators are completed.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we go on to assistant commissioners?

Any more questions on the weighing of grain?

The WITNESS:

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS

Complaints from producers investigated by Assistant Commissioners during the 1951 calendar year totalled 118, distributed by provinces of origin as follows: Alberta, 4; Saskatchewan, 85; Manitoba, 29.

In addition 2,199 country elevators were inspected by the Assistant Commissioners—Alberta, 1,258; Saskatchewan, 402; Manitoba, 539 houses.

Assistant Commissioners of the Board also took up the matter of excessive overages with country elevator agents concerned. Storage facilities covered by Special Annex or "offsite" storage licence were inspected by these officials, and applicants for out-of-turn cars investigated.

A very considerable number of complaints were investigated during 1951 respecting the operation of the car order book. These complaints

originated for the most part in the Province of Saskatchewan where the car order book was in general use during the Fall season up to the date of its temporary suspension on December 4, 1951.

In addition to his regular duties, Assistant Commissioner Rayner since September 1, 1951, has acted as the Winnipeg representative of the Transport Controller.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions with respect to the assistant commissioners?

Mr. WRIGHT: There would appear to be an anomaly in the number of inspections. There were 85 complaints in the province of Saskatchewan, but there were only 402 inspections whereas in Alberta there were only 4 complaints and 1,258 inspections were conducted. Is there an explanation of that?

Mr. VALLANCE: Yes, there is, Mr. Wright, and you partly answered your own question. It is that in Saskatchewan there were 85 complaints which took considerable time. To top it off Assistant Commissioner McLean had gone through a very serious operation during that period and had lost, I would say, considerable time and as is set out here the car order book was in great demand and true, there were 85 in Saskatchewan but I think there is another thing to be said to vindicate this business that some of these complaints were not settled at once. I can mention complaints here which I am not proposing to do which took Assistant Commissioner McLean as many as ten visits to get any kind of a settlement or understanding to get over a complaint and settle it. Now, as I say in Alberta your car order book was practically non-existent, Manitoba's to a lesser degree than it was in Saskatchewan, but it was for those reasons that MacLean was not able to make the inspections which he will show that he made this year.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is he still the assistant commissioner?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. WARD: Why was the car order book suspended?

The CHAIRMAN: That is the next paragraph, Mr. Ward. Any other comments with respect to assistant commissioners?

Shall the paragraph carry?

Carried.

We will now pass on to car order books.

The WITNESS:

CAR ORDER BOOK

With the commencement of Fall deliveries of the 1951 crop, the car order book was put into operation at many points in the Province of Saskatchewan. Car order book custodians were also appointed by the railway companies at a considerable number of places in Saskatchewan not supplied with railway agents. The car order book was used to a much lesser degree in Alberta and Manitoba during 1951.

Many complaints of inequity in car order book operations were investigated and the experience of the Board demonstrated that under this year's abnormal conditions the use of the car order book defeated the preference orders of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Accordingly, on December 4, 1951, after consultation with the Canadian Wheat Board and the Board of Grain Commissioners, the Transport Controller suspended operation of the car order book until July 31, 1952, to speed up loading at country points of preference orders and shipment of damp grain.

Now, I think perhaps Mr. Milner could give you all the information you desire on that.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions you would like to direct to Mr. Milner on the car order book?

By Mr. Ward:

Q. What was the real reason for suspending it?—A. It is given there in the report.

Q. That was the reason?—A. Yes.

Mr. FAIR: We were informed yesterday that the car order suspension will be done away with at the end of next month.

Mr. VALLANCE: That is the hope.

Mr. WRIGHT: My observation is that the car order book is becoming more difficult to operate because of our quota system in the west, and there has been a suggestion advanced to me, which I think will come up at the next annual pool meeting, that perhaps there is another way in which we can get a fairer distribution of cars other than the use of the car order book. The suggestion is that the farmer has, as we all know, the permit book for delivery, and that a month before the season opens, when those permit books are issued to the farmer he writes in his acreage in the permit book, that he then writes into the permit book his preference with regard to delivery, that is, to what elevator he would like to deliver his grain at a particular point. He may make a choice to send it to the pool elevator or he may not. He may want to deliver it to some other elevator, and that allocation of cars at that particular point should be in accordance with the choices made by the farmers at that point. With regard to the elevator at which he prefers to deliver his grain, it would appear to me that that is a reasonable suggestion. I do not know whether you people would have any comments on it, but I would like to have your opinion on it as to whether you believe that would be a feasible and a reasonable suggestion.

Mr. VALLANCE: I would either suggest to you that it would be either reasonable or probable that it should be done. I think you have to go back to the origin of the car order book. Elevator companies were not considered in the original setting up of the car order book, and are not now any more than when a farmer makes his preference he sets out on his application where he wants the car placed. What you are saying now, Mr. Wright, is that if you and I want to deliver all our grain to the pool and as a result of the Wrights and the Vallances expressing a preference for the pool at any given point that the pool would handle 75 per cent, so that 75 per cent of the cars would go to the pool elevator. That is what you are contending?

Mr. WRIGHT: That is right, that the choice of the individual farmer as to delivery be taken into consideration. The farmer sets out in his own book just as if he went and put his name on the car order book. Instead of putting his name on the car order book he puts his choice as to the elevator in the permit book.

Mr. VALLANCE: Let us look at it from a practical standpoint. Suppose you and I decided to put it into the pool and suppose the pool elevator becomes blocked because of the condition that might exist or has existed in the past, because we stated on our quota because we wanted to do it that way. You might have four or five elevators there into which you could not put your grain. Is that desirable? I am not arguing now, it is just stating the facts.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is not desirable, but I do think when the elevators are filled then the farmer should have a choice of delivering to the elevators at which he feels he would like to deliver, and I think that under this system your elevators would be filled. I do not think there is any point where one hundred per cent of the farmers are going to register as wishing to deliver to the pool. You are talking of a theoretical possibility, which is not likely to arise.

Mr. VALLANCE: I would not say that from the information that this board has now available that over 50 per cent of all your grain is handled through one concern now with all the disadvantages, if they are that, which I am not arguing. Suppose that what you are contending now were to take place. Your supposition is that we would raise that from 50 per cent to 80 per cent.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not supposing anything. I am just putting forward a case.

Mr. VALLANCE: Let us take a car alone. How many farmers under the quota can ship a carload through any one elevator at any one time? Let us be honest about it.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is just the point. Under the car order book you have to have a carload of grain. Under this system you do not need to have a carload, it is allocated to the elevator. Some people say that under that system one elevator might have five or six cars on a certain day, while another may only have one, but it is not impossible to do, to lay off five or six cars overnight at one elevator and have them loaded available for the train when it comes back on this branch line the next day, in the afternoon perhaps, and picks up loaded cars. I am quite confident, at least it works out in our area, that all the cars that would normally be left at any one point could be loaded without undue delay under a system such as I am suggesting, and it seems entirely unfair to me that I may be a pool member or otherwise, but personally I belong to the pool—but if I have facilities there I should be able to use them, and if this fellow does not want to use those facilities he should have that opportunity. Some reasonable preference should be given to the farmer as far as his wishes are concerned.

Mr. VALLANCE: The basis of the car order book was never intended for that purpose, not to pay tribute to any one elevator, even by the farmer. If the farmer wants to put it through one elevator, he can do that.

Mr. WRIGHT: He can do it under the car order book, but it is becoming obsolete because of the quotas.

Mr. QUELCH: I think that there are a lot more cars allotted under the car order book than the capacity of the elevator.

Mr. VALLANCE: No, the car order book at every station sets out very definitely the orders that a car will be placed in the order of the names on the car order book.

Mr. QUELCH: I say the number of cars that are allotted to an elevator do not agree with the car order book. I know of several cases where a certain elevator has been blocked and another elevator has room in it, and yet the same number of cars are dropped off at the blocked elevator as are dropped off at the elevator with room. You would think the logical thing would be to send cars to the elevators that are blocked.

Mr. VALLANCE: If that is so, that is the reason the car order book was discontinued.

Mr. QUELCH: I am not complaining of the car order book, but I know there were two or three instances last fall where the pool elevator was full and farmers wanted to haul their wheat and some of the other elevators were not full, and they got as many cars. The cars should be allocated according to need.

The WITNESS: There was another consideration in the last few years and that was the preference orders of the Wheat Board. They demanded that grain of a certain quota or condition had to be moved out first, and those cars had to be set out wherever this grain was.

Mr. WRIGHT: And that condition is not likely to be a continuing condition?

Mr. MILNER: We hope not.

Mr. FAIR: While dealing with that, Mr. Chairman, I might bring to Mr. Milner's attention another thing. We had a particular district, a section where a train comes in on Thursday of each week, and that is the last train till the next week, again on the same day. At Rivercourse they have only two elevators there and they were getting many more cars than they could use, while other points, such as McLaughlin and Paradise Valley at the end of the line did not get sufficient cars. I wrote quite a few letters about it. Somebody got them and I expect that things are different there now, but that condition should not be allowed to exist. I understand the elevator agent in Rivercourse protested to the conductor of the freight train, but the conductor said you are going to get them, whether you like it or not, with the result that these cars could not be used, while the other elevators were waiting for them.

Mr. MILNER: If you had talked to the dispatcher or to the superintendent, that condition would be straightened out. It might happen. Do you think it is fixed now?

Mr. FAIR: I hope so. I have had no complaints recently.

Mr. MILNER: I can put it on the agenda with the rest of them.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on the car order book?

Carried.

Shall we go to Supplementary Storage?

The WITNESS:

SUPPLEMENTARY STORAGE

In order to relieve the storage and transportation situation, Order-in-Council P.C. 5122 dated September 26, 1951, authorized the Board to permit the use by country elevator licensees of suitable supplementary "offsite" or special annex storage space for the warehousing of wheat under regulation by the Board.

The issuance of licences for storage of this type was restricted to warehouses meeting certain structural specifications, subject to inspection and approval by Board officials.

Owing to the difficulty of storage due to the excessive moisture condition of the 1951 crop, fewer applications for special storage licences were received by the Board than was originally anticipated. By December 31, 1951, only thirty-eight (38) applications for this type of licence had been filed with the Board, and thirty-one (31) supplementary storage licences issued for a total warehousing space of 678,700 bushels.

That is largely self-explanatory.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask a question here of Mr. McKenzie. Would you suggest or say that under present harvesting conditions that greater storage space—and extra drying facilities would be of benefit to the farmers in western Canada and in particular northwestern Saskatchewan?

The WITNESS: Well, I would not give you a hasty decision on that at all. I think there is a lot to be considered in doing it. For instance, it is true we have had a very serious situation in the west in the last two years, but it is also true that for 20 years previously we had no drying problem, and the same is also very true that the least expensive position in which to dry grain is in the terminal elevator. Now, whether or not additional drying facilities should be established at different points in the country involves, first of all, I would suggest, heavy capital expenditures and it means an interruption to the flow of the grain. These are all features that would have to be considered before I would say yes or no.

Mr. WRIGHT: Have you any idea as to the number of co-operatives or small operators that bought the small dryers last year? What was your experience with that?

Dr. ANDERSON: The number of dryers that came to our attention through our efforts to give them service was something over 100. It was a little difficult to pin it down exactly whether it was 105 or 110. Our experience with the work that they did was that it was satisfactory except for one make of dryer, of which there were four in the country, that were not designed for drying wheat and could not operate successfully with wheat. The operators of those machines were persuaded to move on to coarse grains.

Mr. FAIR: Would the result of the drying of these machines be in the same category as that which you answered this morning, that there were satisfactory results?

Dr. ANDERSON: Yes, the large majority of the farmers drying by and large were warned. We gave them a good deal of warning that this was a particular technical operation. They played it safe and, therefore, they did no damage.

Mr. QUELCH: Did the success of that depend on drying the grain down to 14?

Dr. ANDERSON: No, it depended on keeping the temperature of the air down.

Mr. ROSS: Did they burn some of the grains?

Dr. ANDERSON: Yes. The safe temperature of these small grain dryers is something around 130 and 140 degrees, and in the terminals you can get up to 175 and 180. This particular dryer was operating somewhere around between 600 and 700 degrees.

Mr. ROSS: That would be cooking.

Mr. VALLANCE: Before we leave that, Mr. Chairman, I think there is another thing which should be said here, that out of the dryers that were in operation I would say that over 98 per cent of them were commercial dryers, that is, they were made in factories. We did have some trouble with farm-made dryers. I think that should be said.

Dr. ANDERSON: Mr. Vallance, that is not quite the latest figure.

Mr. VALLANCE: What was it? You failed to say what it was.

Dr. ANDERSON: The figures were that there were approximately 30 of these 100-odd dryers that were reported to us that were home-made dryers, most of them following designs gotten out by the University of Saskatchewan.

Mr. ROSS: Did those home-made dryers burn the grain the same way?

Dr. ANDERSON: No, they were operating reasonably satisfactorily.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think we should tell them of the service you rendered to them, Dr. Anderson.

Dr. ANDERSON: When we saw this coming up, with the co-operation of the companies operating country elevators, we tried to make a survey and looked over country dryers that were in operation, and got them to submit samples before and after drying so we could check them. Now, it seemed to work fairly well. We made a few tests on a great many of these 100-odd dryers. The board also required by one of its orders that the dried grain should be shown on the way slip, so we knew when they were coming and we tested every one of those cars so I think we are pretty sure that there was practically no damage by the farm dryer.

Mr. FAIR: Very good.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we come to paragraph, Shipping Permit No. 100 and Grain Drying.

The WITNESS:

SHIPPING PERMIT NO. 100 AND GRAIN DRYING

By early January, 1951, Lakehead storage was quickly becoming congested. The railways were compelled to slow down the flow of box cars to the Lakehead to coincide with the volume of outward rail shipments from the Twin City ports. Meanwhile large stocks of tough and damp grain, remained in country elevators and on Western farms. The damp grain particularly, required to be dried without delay to prevent further deterioration.

Accordingly, the Board on January 22, 1951, under special shipping authority designated as Permit No. 100, instructed the railways to supply cars for shipment to the Lakehead of damp grain from Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and damp coarse grains from Alberta.

By February 15, 1951, it was possible for the Board to extend this permit order to include shipment to terminals of tough grain with a moisture content of 16% or more, and from Alberta, tough coarse grains with a moisture content of 16% or greater. Permission was also granted for the shipment of tough flax under the Board's Special Permit No. 100.

In all matters relating to the movement of this tough and damp grain to the terminal elevators, the Board of Grain Commissioners acted in close collaboration with the Canadian Wheat Board.

On March 28, 1951, the Board of Grain Commissioners withdrew its special shipping instructions on assurance by the Canadian Wheat Board that shipping preferences would be established to give priority to outstanding car orders on Permit No. 100, and also to the movement of damp grain from country points.

Further substantial quantities of tough grain were dried by mixing with straight grade grain, and over 51 million bushels of tough and damp grain were put through terminal elevator driers during the 1950-51 crop year.

Transportation agencies and elevator companies co-operated to the fullest possible extent in the handling of the 1950 crop and losses reported through spoilage were negligible.

The 1951 Western crop presents an even more serious transportation and handling problem. Shipping authority under Permit No. 100 was invoked by the Board on November 22, 1951, to ensure priority for the movement of damp grain to the terminals.

Terminal elevator drying equipment is operating again this year on round-the-clock schedules. Everything is being done to meet the exigencies of the situation.

Mr. WARD: Mr. McKenzie, was the country able to dry all the damp and tough grain that was shipped or that was available to be shipped?

The WITNESS: You mean up to date? Well, Arthur Dollery can answer that, but I think this can be said, that there are still substantial quantities of tough grain, in particular, in the terminals and some of the country houses that has to be taken care of, but by and large, subject to some small local conditions, there has been no substantial spoilage of grain that we know of. I would just like to speak on the project in the United States. I have to thank the Wheat Board for these figures. I think you were told by the Wheat Board that considerable drying was taking place at Buffalo, Duluth, Walkerville and Toronto elevators, as well as the terminals at the lakehead, and the Pacific and Ontario terminals. Now, Sarnia has been shipping damp 3 Norman, 70,529.40; damp 4 Norman, 56,187 bushels; damp No. 5 wheat, 613,497 bushels; a total of 740,209 bushels, to Sarnia.

Toronto elevators, damp No. 5 wheat is being shipped, 292,542. That is all that Toronto did.

Walkerville, 313,651 bushels. Duluth, in box cars from the west, 6,078,880 bushels, by car; complete total shipped to Duluth was 8,202,337 bushels. Buffalo was shipped 6,087,201 bushels. That is a grand total in my figures of 15,635,942. That is not completely all dry yet, but I think possibly by the end of July it will all be cleaned up. Now, the Wheat Board shipped that number of tons to these ports, and I had to service those ports with some of my inspection staff. I had seven men down at Duluth and there were nine men at Buffalo to look after and supervise drying, and each block is being tested by Dr. Anderson as it is being dried. Also, every cargo shipped out is tested so we can be assured that our export markets are being protected. There has never been anything damaged. That is all I have to say on that.

Mr. FERRIE: All that expense is taken out of that \$2 a car, is it?

The WITNESS: That would not begin to pay the wages.

Mr. FERRIE: Who pays that?

Mr. ROSS: You and I.

The WITNESS: The taxpayer.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. McKenzie just said "the taxpayer" there. This drying is not being done at government expense, is it? It is being done at the expense of the farmers through the Wheat Board. I want to get that clear.

The WITNESS: I am not thinking of drying costs, I am thinking of the costs we have to assume in staffing these elevators.

Mr. FERRIE: And that comes out of what?

The WITNESS: That comes out of the taxpayer. That is charged up to the appropriation parliament gives us every year.

Mr. ROSS: Those are the members of your staff?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. FERRIE: Is drying a charge against the wheat pool?

The CHAIRMAN: To settle an argument we had at noon today, I would like you to answer this question: Are you paid from the proceeds from the farmers' grain or paid by the dominion government?

The WITNESS: We are paid by the government. We do, though, charge a \$2 inspection fee.

Mr. FERRIE: Where does that go?

The WITNESS: It goes to pay these costs of inspection. It all goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, that is where it goes.

Mr. VALLANCE: Parliament voted money for us to spend in the administration of the Canada Grain Act. We charge various services and we have never been able to get enough money in charges to pay the cost of the administration of the Canada Grain Act.

Mr. FAIR: And what is left is paid by the farmers indirectly or directly?

Mr. ROSS: This statement of Mr. Dollery's takes care of the tough and damp grain in the country now?

The WITNESS: Pretty largely.

Mr. WARD: Is there or do you anticipate any loss through failure to dry this grain?

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, my only answer to that is that up to the moment we have no reason to think there will be any reasonably substantial loss. We have no evidence of it at all. There may be some odd elevators that take a little licking, I do not know, but we have not heard of it.

Mr. VALLANCE: There may be a few farmers who will take a little licking.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we go on now to Elevator Charges. Might I suggest we take this as having been read? I think it is hardly necessary that we ask Mr. McKenzie to read all those figures, but if there are any questions on pages 9, 10 or 11 they can be answered. I think we should take this part of the report as being read. What is your pleasure? This could be all put in the record. Is that agreed that we take it as being read, subject to any questions?

Agreed.

The WITNESS:

ELEVATOR CHARGES

At public meetings held by the Board in Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver in June and July, 1951, members of the grain trade made representations in the matter of maximum grain handling tariffs for the 1951-52 crop year.

After considering the evidence submitted, the Board authorized an upward adjustment in elevation, shovelling and cleaning charges to offset increased costs.

Maximum rates for storage and drying were, however, lowered by the Board for the new crop season.

On August 1, 1951, the under-noted revisions in elevator tariffs became effective:

EASTERN ELEVATORS

Georgian Bay and Lower Lake Ports:

- Elevation:—(a) Grain for export—increased from $1\frac{1}{2}$ c. to $1\frac{1}{4}$ c. per bus.
 (b) Receiving from cars—increased from $1\frac{1}{2}$ c. to $1\frac{1}{8}$ c. per bus.
 (c) Receiving from wagons or trucks—increased from 2c. to $2\frac{1}{4}$ c. per bus.
 (d) Delivering to trucks in bulk, in addition to the ordinary elevation charge— $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per bus.
 (Not included in previous tariff regulations)

- Storage:— (a) For each day or part thereof after the first ten days—reduced from 1/25c. to 1/30c. per bus.

Upper St. Lawrence Group:

- Elevation:—(a) Receiving from vessels:
 Single-deck vessels—increased from \$6.25 to \$7.00 per 1,000 bus.
 (b) Double-deck vessels—increased from \$6.75 to \$8.25 per 1,000 bus.
 (c) Discharging to vessels—increased from \$4.25 to \$5.00 per 1,000 bus.

- Storage:— (a) For each day or part thereof after the first ten days—reduced from 1/25c. to 1/30c. per bus.

Lower St. Lawrence Group:

- Elevation:—(a) Receiving from canal or lake vessels:
 Single-deck vessels—increased from \$8.50 to \$9.00 per 1,000 bus.
 Double-deck vessels—increased from \$9.25 to \$9.75 per 1,000 bus.
 (b) Receiving from ocean vessels—increased from \$10.00 to \$10.50 per 1,000 bus.
 (c) Receiving from railway cars, wagons or trucks—increased from \$8.50 to \$9.00 per 1,000 bus.
 (d) Discharging to vessels, railway cars, wagons or trucks—increased from \$5.75 to \$6.00 per 1,000 bus.

- Storage:— (a) For each day or part thereof after the first ten days—reduced from 1/25c. to 1/30c. per bus.

Atlantic Ports

- Elevation:— Increased from 1.425c. to 1.55c. per bus.
 Storage:— For each day thereof after the first ten days—reduced from 1/25c. to 1/30c. per bus.

General

- Shovelling:— Single-deck vessels—increased from \$4.00 to \$5.00 per 1,000 bus.
 Double-deck vessels—increased from \$6.00 to \$7.00 per 1,000 bus.

Country Elevators

- Elevation:— Wheat, barley, rye and corn—increased from 2½c. to 2⅝c. per bus.
 Oats—increased from 2c. to 2½c. per bus.
 Flax—increased from 4½c. to 4¾c. per bus.
 Sunflower Seed—increased from 6c. to 6½c. per cwt.
 Storage:— For each day or part thereof after the first fifteen days—
 all grain except Sunflower Seed—reduced from 1/25c. to 1/30c. per bus.
 Allowance for Invisible Loss and Shrinkage:
 Sunflower Seed added to shrinkage table at same rates applying to oats and barley.

TERMINAL ELEVATORS

Fort William, Port Arthur and Winnipeg

- Elevation:—(a) Wheat, oats, barley and corn—increased from 2c. to 2½c. per bus.
 (b) Rye—increased from 2½c. to 2⅝c. per bus.
 (c) Flax—increased from 3½c. to 3¾c. per bus.
 (d) Screenings—increased from 4½c. to 4¾c. per cwt.
 (e) Sunflower Seed—increased from 4c. to 4½c. per cwt.
 Storage:— For each day or part thereof after the first ten days—
 wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax and corn—reduced from 1/25c. to 1/30c. per bus.

West of Calgary, Alta.

- Elevation:—(a) Wheat, oats, barley and corn—increased from 2c. to 2½c. per bus.
 (b) Rye—increased from 2½c. to 2⅝c. per bus.
 (c) Flax—increased from 3½c. to 3¾c. per bus.
 (d) Screenings—increased from 4½c. to 4¾c. per cwt.
 (e) Sunflower Seed—increased from 4c. to 4½c. per cwt.
 Storage:— For each day or part thereof after the first ten days—
 Wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax and corn—reduced from 1/25c. to 1/30c. per bus.

Government Interior Terminal Elevators

- Elevation:—(a) Wheat, oats and barley—increased from 1c. to 1½c. per bus.
 rye and corn
 Receiving from railway cars—
 (b) Flax—increased from 2c. to 2½c. per bus.
 (c) Screenings—increased from 3c. to 3½c. per cwt.
 (d) Sunflower Seed—increased from 4c. to 4½c. per cwt.
 Receiving from wagons or trucks—all grain—increased from 1½c. to 1⅝c. per bus.

Churchill, Manitoba

- Elevation:—(a) Wheat, oats and barley—increased from 2c. to 2½c. per bus.
 (b) Rye—increased from 2½c. to 2⅝c. per bus.
 (c) Flax—increased from 3½c. to 3¾c. per bus.
 (d) Screenings—increased from 4½c. to 4¾c. per cwt.
 Storage:— For each day or part thereof after the first eight days—
 Wheat, oats, barley, rye and flax—
 from August 1 to October 8 (inclusive)—reduced from 1/25c. to 1/30c. per bus.
 from October 9 to July 31 of the following year inclusive—increased from 1/90c. to 1/50c. per bus.

General

Cleaning:— (a) Flax—containing from 5½% to 10% dockage—increased from 2c. to 2½c. per bus.
containing more than 10% dockage—increased from 2½c. to 3c. per bus.

Drying:— (a) All Grain except Flax, Sunflower Seed and the malting grades of Barley
Tough—reduced from 4½c. to 3¾c. per bus.
Damp—reduced from 7½c. to 6¼c. per bus.
(b) Flax and the malting grades of barley—
Tough—reduced from 5c. to 4c. per bus.
Damp—reduced from 9c. to 7c. per bus.

The record high moisture condition of the 1951 crop due to unfavourable harvesting posed problems of drying and storage for the elevator companies, more serious than ever before experienced.

It was imperative that the fullest use be made of drying facilities to save as much grain as possible from spoiling. On representation from the trade, the Board revised the drying tariff, effective November 12, 1951, partially restoring the cut in rates put in force on August 1, 1951. Subsequently, on December 22, 1951, the Board authorized higher terminal elevator drying rates for flaxseed and malting barley and other damp grain showing over 20 per cent moisture content.

A review of drying tariff changes over the past thirty years is shown in table form below:

Effective Date	All Grain Except Sunflower Seeds		All Grain Except Flax Sunflower Seeds and Malting Barley		Flax and Malting Barley	
	Tough	Damp and Wet	Tough	Damp	Tough	Damp
	Per bu.		Per bu.		Per bu.	
	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.
Sept. 5, 1919* to Nov. 2, 1950.....	3	5				
Nov. 3, 1950 to July 31, 1951.....			4½	7½	5	9
Aug. 1, 1951 to Nov. 11, 1951.....			3¾	6¼	4	7
Nov. 12, 1951 to Dec. 21, 1951.....			4	6½	4½	8
Dec. 22, 1951 to date.....			4	up to and including 20% moisture 6½c. Over 20% moisture 7½c.	5	9

* This is the earliest date for which official record is readily available.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions with regard to elevator charges, on pages 9, 10 and 11?

Mr. WRIGHT: Are those charges additional to those negotiated by the elevator companies for the handling of their grain for the Wheat Board that are negotiated each year by the Wheat Board, or do you people enter into these negotiations?

Mr. MILNER: These tariffs are set by the Board of Grain Commissioners after negotiation with the elevator companies. What arrangement is made by the Wheat Board under this maximum is no concern of ours.

Mr. WRIGHT: These are maximum?

The WITNESS: These are all maximum charges.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand here something that should go into the record. It is a supplementary statement on tough grain, western division. Now, the total tough all told is 41,693,000 and your damp grain, 52,556,000. Now, these are supplied to us from the actual operation of the dryers.

Mr. FERRIE: That is nearly 100,000,000 bushels.

Mr. VALLANCE: That is what they are.

Mr. FERRIE: And that was all dried?

Mr. VALLANCE: That is so, and I think that is right, Mr. Commissioner, is it not?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: We have not had time to read all the schedules here. Do you set the diversion charges?

The WITNESS: No, we have not anything to do with them.

Mr. ROSS: That is done between the various companies and the Wheat Board?

The WITNESS: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright is still thinking about that word "diversion".

Mr. WRIGHT: I am going to kill those diversion charges if it is the last thing I do.

Mr. HETLAND: On page 10 it says Eastern Elevators—Concluded, Lower St. Lawrence Group. Now, this elevator charge of \$8.50 to \$9.00 per 1,000 bushels, who pays for that, the farmer or the producer?

The WITNESS: My opinion is that he does not. The purchaser of the grain pays for his grain f.o.b. Fort William, Vancouver or Churchill. You may, if you want to, argue that the producer of the grain is the one who pays the price, but the price in Canadian grain figures on the cost of getting it over and perhaps that influences the price the foreign buyer is prepared to offer, but as a general practice I would say no, that it is not costing the producer any money.

Mr. HETLAND: For instance, we will say the price is \$1.82 f.o.b. Fort William. Certainly the buyer would pay this, then, wouldn't he?

The WITNESS: That is right. The producer loses title to his grain when he takes settlement at the terminal points, like at the head of the lakes.

Mr. HETLAND: Well, it appears that the purchaser pays that charge.

Mr. ROSS: Who has title to the grain when it is delivered to the country elevator?

Mr. VALLANCE: That is a debatable question. Some argue they are, because the elevator companies are the agents of the board. We are not prepared to argue that. It is a matter to be settled between the agents of the board and the board themselves.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that section of the report carried?
Carried.

We will now go on to page 12, Regulations of the Board.

The WITNESS:

REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD

On July 23, 1951, the Board amended, effective August 1, 1951, the Regulations made under authority of The Canada Grain Act by re-enacting the following regulations:—

No. 5—Off Grades for Western Grain.

No. 6—Off Grades for Eastern Grain.

No. 16—Fees.

No. 20—Maximum Tariff of Charges, Eastern Elevators.

No. 21—Maximum Tariff of Charges and Shrinkage Allowance—Country Elevators.

No. 22—Maximum Tariff of Charges—Terminal Elevators.

On September 25, 1951, the Board amended Regulation No. 16, Fees, effective October 1, 1951, to establish a uniform charge for the inspection of unofficial samples, submitted either by licensees or persons other than licensees.

On September 27, 1951, Regulation No. 16, Fees, was amended by the Board effective November 1, 1951, to bring the weighing fees charged in the Eastern Division more nearly into line with fees in effect in the Western Division.

Effective November 12 and December 22, 1951, the Board amended Regulation No. 22, Maximum Tariff of Charges, Terminal Elevators, to provide for increased charges for drying.

Most of these regulations have been referred to already in the discussions.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall this section carry?

Carried.

Shall we pass on to Lake Freight Rates?

The WITNESS:

LAKE FREIGHT RATES

Application for revised maximum water carrying rates on grain from the Lakehead was made to the Board by the various shipping interests before the opening of the 1951 navigation season.

Following discussions with interested shipping concerns, the Board, on February 5, 1951, issued Order No. 19 rescinding maximum lake freight rates in effect and authorizing increased rates for the 1951 season as indicated below.

	Wheat and Rye	Barley	Oats
	c. per bu.	c. per bu.	c. per bu.
To Georgian Bay Ports, Goderich, Sarnia and Walkerville.....	5½	5¼	5
To Port Colborne.....	7½	7¼	6½
To Toronto.....	8	7½	7¼
To Kingston.....	8½	8¼	8
To Prescott.....	9	8½	8½
To Montreal, Sorel, Three Rivers and Quebec City. Direct or transferred at Intermediate Ports.....	16	15¼	14

This order of the Board also authorized an increase of 2 cents per bushel over the above maximum rates for tonnage loaded during December, 1951, to provide for increased insurance costs.

Mr. ARGUE: Could you give the committee some idea of the increase in those freight rates over the last five or six years—just a very rough idea?

Mr. CALDER: Order No. 18 was a previous order of the board placed in fact on October 14, 1948, and the rate to the Georgian Bay, Goderich, Sarnia and Walkerville, on wheat and rye at that time was 4½ cents. Then order No. 19 boosted the rate to 5½ cents. If the committee likes, we will confine this report on rates to wheat and rye alone.

The rate to Port Colborne was boosted from 6 cents to 7½ cents; Toronto, 6½ cents to 8 cents; Kingston, 7 cents to 8½ cents; Prescott, 7¼ cents to 9 cents; to Montreal, Sorel, Three Rivers or Quebec,—previously there was ½¢ extra when transferred at intermediate points, but from October 14, 1948 the rate was 12½ cents, and on February 5, 1951 it went to a rate of 16 cents.

Mr. ARGUE: What was the rate comparable to the 12½ cents, the rate previous to that? You gave the 1948 rate. What was the rate effective before that, before the one you read?

Mr. MILNER: I think it was 12½.

Mr. ARGUE: No increase on that?

Mr. CALDER: 11 cents.

Mr. ARGUE: The direct rate to Montreal, Sorel, Three Rivers and Quebec City, wheat and rye was 11 cents per bushel, and transferred—as Mr. Milner has pointed out, the transfer rate on wheat and rye, April 24, 1948, was 11½ cents per bushel.

Mr. HETLAND: Could you say what the rate was around 1940, just approximately? Just give us the Montreal rate, that would be good enough, just so that we could see the relationship.

Mr. CALDER: During September, 1938 up till June 7, 1941, the board issued order No. 3 setting a maximum rate for milling wheat at the lakehead to ports at Montreal, Sorel, Three Rivers, at 7 cents per bushel. On this record it does not distinguish between direct or transferred. I am not sure about the 7 cents applying.

Mr. MILNER: I think it should be stated under the Act the board is required to give consideration to existing rates between comparable American ports or the rates comparable to the hauling of other commodities. We have had to do that.

Mr. WRIGHT: You said these rates are under negotiation?

The WITNESS: Yes, after hearing representations and taking into consideration the rates in effect on other commodities.

Mr. WRIGHT: What was the difficulty in getting shipping? Was it the rates or other conditions? About a year ago now I think there was a shortage of lake shipping—we heard in the press that the boats were being used for the movement of iron ore, and it was only after an order of the board that they were transferred to the grain trade. Could you give us any account of what took place at that time?

Mr. MILNER: I cannot, I was not transport controller then.

Mr. WRIGHT: You had some negotiations at that time and an order was issued for the bottoms to be turned over to the movement of grain.

Mr. MILNER: They have not got authority to do that.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: No. There was a very severe shortage. The crop was much larger than previous crops. Earlier we had been getting by. There had been very little building of lake carriers during the war years, and the building program was just then getting under way, but no new boats had been delivered. So there was a genuine shortage of shipping. At that time we also had a back log of grain. Shippers were hungry for tonnage, but there were not the boats available. It took some time to get the boats back into the grain trade, but they were persuaded to get back into it.

Mr. ROSS: The boats were busy hauling ore.

Mr. WRIGHT: What percentage of the boats are Canadian bottoms that are in the grain trade?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: All of them, ordinarily. Under the coasting laws, the haul between two Canadian ports must be in a Canadian bottom. But during the last two years there has not been any, as the oil companies were using the boats. We are using a few American boats, but the Americans have just as serious a problem as we have. But now new boats are coming in. We

got in two or three big boats at the beginning of this season, and another one will come in in July; but it will take a couple of years yet to get our normal tonnage back in the trade.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions under "Lake freight rates"? If not, I think we have already had the next section on "Audit of stocks—terminal and eastern elevators", and if there are no more questions on "Lake freight rates", we can go on to page 13, to the heading "Canadian government elevators".

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT ELEVATORS

Over four times the volume of grain was handled by the Canadian Government Interior Terminal Elevators in 1950-51 than during the previous crop year.

Grain receipts for all houses during the crop season 1950-51 totalled 13,195,456 bushels. Saskatoon and Moose Jaw elevators handled the bulk of this movement which was mostly low-grade grain.

Although the Prince Rupert house was licensed as a public terminal, no grain was taken in or shipped from the elevator during the 1950-51 crop season. A steady flow of grain has been received at Prince Rupert however, since October, 1951, and it is anticipated that some twelve vessel cargoes may clear from the Port in 1951-52.

The Port Arthur elevator continues to be operated by the McCabe Grain Company Limited under lease, which expires July 31, 1954.

The Canadian Government Elevators system had an operating surplus of \$134,968.92 for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1951, in contrast with a deficit of \$218,499.43 for the previous year.

Revenue from the Canadian Government Elevators for the 1950-51 fiscal period totalled \$700,693.31 and expenditures amounted to \$565,724.39.

The installation of a dust control system in the Calgary Elevator has been completed.

A modern passenger elevator equipment is being installed at the Port Arthur Elevator to relace obsolete equipment, and certain timber construction of the elevator offices is being replaced by fire resistant materials.

The conversion from coal to gas consumption of the drier and heating boilers of the Lethbridge Elevator is in progress.

Certain sections of the dock pile bracing at Prince Rupert have been renewed and the renewal of the entire dock pile bracing will be completed during the coming season.

All elevator buildings, equipment and railway trackage have been maintained in good operating condition.

Mr. HETLAND: The reason for the surplus last year was, I presume, because the elevators are always full. Is that the idea?

The WITNESS: Yes, and because of the handling we got.

By Mr. Harkness:

Q. What is this dust control system?—A. It is a system which is installed in terminal elevators to draw off the dust in handling the grain.

Q. It is an air operated affair?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Yes. Dust control has been greatly improved in the last two or three years. The elevators generally always had a dust collecting system, but the elevators were always getting dust troubles. We had a very bad explosion at Port Arthur a few years ago with some loss of life, and all the elevators stepped up the pace to perfect dust controls. There has been a tremendous improvement in the system, and a great deal of money has been

spent on it both by the public as well as by the private elevators, but I think it has been well worth while, and I think the danger of explosion has been pretty well eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on the government elevators? If not I think we can go to the wheat bonus. I think we had the committees on grain standards this morning so we will go to wheat bonus at the bottom of page 13.

The WITNESS:

WHEAT BONUS

Wheat bonus certificates in the amount of Fifty Cents (50c) were redeemed during 1951 and certificates outstanding as at December 31, 1951, amounted to \$7,745.83.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions with respect to the bonus?

By Mr. Fair:

Q. What does that bonus consist of?—A. As I understand it is part of the old wheat bonus.

Mr. CALDER: This came into being on March 3rd, 1931 for the payment of bonus certificates by elevator licencees for the payment of 5 cents per bushel on wheat to growers in 1931 and still hanging fire. We are still redeeming those things and there are a few dribbling in each year.

The WITNESS: We reduced the amount in the year by 50 cents.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, I think we go to page 14—Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

The WITNESS:

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE ACT

The Board continued to collect the 1 per cent levy on the purchase price of grain marketed in the three prairie provinces.

Collections under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act during the 1950-51 crop year totalled \$7,334,059.06. Since August 1, 1939, the date on which this assistance program was first introduced, to July 31, 1951, total monies collected by the Board amounted to \$55,389,412.47.

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. Do the elevator companies get paid for collecting that 1 per cent?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. HETLAND: They do it gratis.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Not willingly; they have asked to be paid several times but the government always felt that collections of that kind are at the expense of the industry.

Mr. WRIGHT: Like income tax.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Yes, we thought it was a bad precedent to start paying them to collect our money.

The CHAIRMAN: We go on to the exhibit at Brandon Winter Fair.

The WITNESS:

EXHIBIT AT BRANDON WINTER FAIR

The Board again arranged for an exhibit at the Manitoba Winter Fair held in Brandon in April, 1951. This exhibit which highlighted the work of the Grain Research Laboratory attracted wide interest.

I will just add this, Mr. Chairman, that for a number of years we have had a little exhibit on at the Brandon Winter Fair for the purpose of advertising,

if you like, and informing farmer visitors to the fair of the nature and extent of the work of our organization. We are not doing it this year because our staff is too busy, our inspection staff and so on are so busy taking care of this present crop we cannot take two or three of them off the staff to send them up there to take care of an exhibit.

Mr. ROSS: You did not have them at the Brandon Trade Fair this summer?

The CHAIRMAN: I think this is a good opportunity for me to suggest that when you get back to normal with your staff that an exhibit of this kind be put on the B circuit of the Western Canada fairs and let information be passed out to the farmers.

The WITNESS: We would be glad to do it as soon as we can spare the time.

Mr. FAIR: I think that is a very good suggestion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we will go on now to personnel. We will take it as having been read.

PERSONNEL

Under Order in Council P.C. 6181 dated November 20, 1951, Mr. Donald Gordon McKenzie, was re-appointed Chief Commissioner of the Board, effective January 1, 1952.

Mr. Earl Edwin Baxter was appointed Chief Statistician of the Board on October 28, 1950.

Mr. Cyril Brownscombe was promoted from Head Clerk, Executive Office, to Registrar, on November 1, 1951.

Mr. Richard Gerald West was promoted to Grain Weighmaster, Winnipeg, on transfer from Fort William, effective November 1, 1951.

Mr. John Joseph Manson was appointed Grain Weighmaster at Vancouver on March 23, 1951.

Mr. Ernest Harold Alexander was appointed Grain Inspector, Grade 3, Toronto, effective February 1, 1951, and Mr. Arthur Metherral Creighton was promoted to Grain Inspector Grade 3, Edmonton, on May 13, 1951.

The following officers of the Board retired during 1951:—

Mr. Frederick Joseph Rathbone, Assistant Commissioner, Fort William, (35 years' service).

Mr. Hugh Carruthers, Grain Weighmaster, Vancouver, (37 years' service).

Mr. David Arthur Benson, Grain Inspector Grade 3, Toronto, (37 years' service).

Mr. John Pike, Grain Inspector Grade 3, Edmonton, (26 years' service).

The Board record its regret at the death of Mr. Edward Llewellyn Jaffray, in May, 1951. Mr. Jaffray was Registrar since 1946, and had been forty years in the employ of the Board.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, this is simply a record of some men who have retired and others who have been promoted on our staff.

The CHAIRMAN: Appointment of Transport Controller.

The WITNESS:

APPOINTMENT OF TRANSPORT CONTROLLER

On August 29, 1951, Commissioner R. W. Milner was appointed Transport Controller by Order in Council P.C. 4558 with wide powers of regulation over the physical movement of grain and other bulk commodities by rail and lake transport.

The services of Commissioner Milner were made available to the Department of Transport by the Board on a loan arrangement.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is there any date in that order in council which terminates Mr. Milner's services?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The order in council terminates but I do not think his services will. I do not see how we could have possibly got the last crop off without a transport controller.

Mr. Milner has done a magnificent job and strangely enough the people he regulates are the most anxious of all to see him on the job because he has made sure that cargoes are available at every point and he has kept everything clear of congestion at terminal points. He has done a grand job and I am afraid he has made sort of a long term place for himself.

Mr. WRIGHT: We can take it for granted we are going to have a permanent place for the controller then?

Mr. FAIR: Carried. We are carrying the idea that Mr. Milner stays on the job.

The WITNESS: Have a heart, we need him.

The CHAIRMAN: Expenditure and revenue, page 15.

The WITNESS:

EXPENDITURE AND REVENUE

Total expenditure covering the operations of the Board for the fiscal year 1950-51, exclusive of the Canadian Government Elevators, amounted to \$2,474,015.56 compared with \$2,370,862.89 for the previous fiscal year. This represents an increase of expenditure for the 1950-51 fiscal period over the previous year of \$103,152.67, due mainly to heavier grain shipments, extensive drying operations and increased salary rates.

Revenue of the Board for 1950-51 totalled \$1,898,357.93 which was \$52,865.96 lower than the earnings of the previous year, recorded at \$1,951,223.89.

Expenditures for the first nine months of the current fiscal year totalled \$2,047,574.70 as against \$1,789,784.00 for a comparable period during the previous fiscal year.

Revenue for the same period of 1951-52 fiscal season amounted to \$2,438,560.91 substantially exceeding the revenue of the previous year for a comparable term, of \$1,564,777.22.

Reports of the various Branches of the Board are appended hereto.

The CHAIRMAN: Any comments with regard to the summary of expenditures and revenues here?

By Mr. Hetland:

Q. I am still interested in that \$1 for a two-pound sample that it costs to get that accepted. Would that have something to do with your \$2,438,000?
—A. Oh, yes, that shows as part of our revenues.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: The fee has not been changed, though, for several years.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. There is the \$2 car inspection fee. What other revenues have you?
—A. There are inspection fees, weighing fees, registration fees, licences and bonding fees, sampling fees and the sale of samples, etc.

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we turn over to page 16—report of the secretary.

The WITNESS: These reports, gentlemen, are Departmental reports of work that are covered in our own report but in more detail. It gives you a lot of

information and we are supplementing that by making available two or three other compilations that will give you considerable additional detailed information.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions?

I do not think we need to have all these appendices read. With your permission I would suggest that we do not have all these read. If there are any questions pertinent to any of them that any of you desire to ask, I think that would be in order.

Mr. WARD: What are you referring to, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: 16 and on.

Mr. WARD: The secretary's report?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. WARD: That is all you are referring to?

The CHAIRMAN: No, page 16 right to the end. If you just take a few moments and go over those pages you might come across something that is of interest to you.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. Mr. McKenzie, what would these complaints consist of that are referred to in complaints?—A. Mostly country complaints. They relate—if you read the paragraph:

During the year ended December 31, 1951, the Board investigated one hundred and twenty-one complaints, including three outstanding as at December 31, 1950, regarding the handling of grain at country elevators, shipments to terminal elevators and the operation of licensees under the Canada Grain Act . . .

They are complaints that come to us and we investigate them with the results as set out here.

The CHAIRMAN: Complaints regarding the elevator agents or the company?

The WITNESS: Oh, yes, for instance, if somebody is trying to manipulate a car order book where it is functioning we would send our investigator out to get the facts or if somebody loaded a car contrary to the provisions of the car order book—a car ordered for wheat and he was trying to stick oats in it—anything of that type.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, in these appendices are the reports of the shortages at the terminal elevators. Yesterday when we had Mr. Phelps before the committee presenting his brief there were certain sections of his brief that were left over until the Board of Grain commissioners was before the committee.

Perhaps this would be as good a time as any that he should have the opportunity of presenting the other part of his brief and asking any questions of the Board of Grain Commissioners that he may have.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Might I suggest that he would have to be elected a member of parliament and be put on this committee before he could ask questions.

The CHAIRMAN: But he could make a statement.

Mr. WRIGHT: The understanding was yesterday—at least as I understood it; that he would be permitted to do that when the Board of Grain Commissioners was here.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Not to question the board. Nobody in this room can question the board unless they are a member of parliament, can they?

Mr. WARD: I think, Mr. Chairman, that was agreed yesterday.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: What was agreed?

Mr. WARD: That we would hear Mr. Phelps today.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: We would hear him, yes, but not that we would let him question the Board of Grain Commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN: Is this on page 7, of your submission you are speaking of, Mr. Wright, grain overages?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: On page 7, Mr. Phelps.

Mr. PHELPS: On this report here.

The CHAIRMAN: I think there was something in your own statement you were speaking of.

Mr. PHELPS: Yes, it was referred to in the brief I presented on behalf of the Farm Union. It is also referred to here in the Board of Grain Commissioners' report.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, is there something that you would desire to say now that you did not say yesterday with respect to this question?

Mr. PHELPS: Well yes there is, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to usurp the privileges of the committee in asking the board any questions. There are a few general statements I would like to direct to the committee as a result of your deliberations of yesterday. It covers about five or seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: Five to ten minutes?

Mr. PHELPS: Yes. One is, I notice in the beginning this morning the statement of Mr. McKenzie which I will heartily agree with that the overages should not be or the shrinkage allowance should not be offset against shortages at any time.

I made a note, during the discussion that other members intimated that that could be done. I think we should get clear on that point and our statement in the brief, that certainly coincided with Mr. McKenzie's statement in that regard.

There was one statement made to the committee in regard to overages that cleaning the seed grain in elevators for farmers would affect the overage position. I think that should be checked because grain that is cleaned for seeding purposes, in my experience, does not go through the books of the elevator in that way and therefore would not show up on the record.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there something in your brief, though, that you wanted to mention that you did not bring out yesterday. Instead of going over the report that we have had today I thought that you were desirous of making a statement that you did not make yesterday pertaining to your own brief?

Mr. PHELPS: Well, those points are covered in the statement, Mr. Chairman, and having to do with overages. I was just elaborating on them, that is all, so that the committee would have the various points before them.

There is one thing that is brought out in the brief that I did not have time to cover last night and it is one that I hope that all members of the committee will keep in mind. That is, that the picture has changed quite substantially. I was very pleased to hear different members of the committee bring that up today. Certain amendments that apply to the Act and worked very well 10 or 15 years ago we find that the conditions have completely altered today and farmers are not being able to take advantage of some of those provisions.

The question was raised and it has been raised in our brief about dissatisfaction in grading. I might say that the cases that were cited in the committee this morning are not exceptional by any means; they are too often the practice. I noticed someone said it was an exceptional case. I want to say on behalf

of the farmers that those cases are too numerous altogether. I want to also say—and I would like to bring to the attention of the committee and I was very pleased to hear the committee suggest that the method of grading tough and damp wheat would be taken under advisement and that it was going to be done next year.

There is one thing, Mr. Chairman, which was mentioned in our brief again that in the light of the discussions which took place just a few moments ago is pertinent. We were suggesting that Mr. Milner's position be continued as transport controller but it does bring up the question of a replacement. I was hoping that some member of the committee might raise that because I feel the interests of the farmers would be better protected if they had a replacement. The duties of the board are becoming more onerous rather than being eliminated.

One point in regard to the report itself here. The surpluses that are apparent for the coming year might indicate—and I hope the committee will take it under advisement—the possibility that maybe the charges that have been levied are in excess of what might have been expected from the farmer and those revisions which were made might be reconsidered because if the present trend in revenues still continues for the balance of the year there would be quite a substantial surplus and it might indicate that the board might give some consideration to a revision.

Another thing I want to say, and that is I certainly have appreciated the opportunity of sitting in on the deliberations of this committee and I think we have all learned a great deal and as a result some worthwhile amendments can be made which will be beneficial to the farmer and the handling of grain and to the commissioners.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions in connection with the end of this report from page 16 on to the end? Has anybody come across anything that they would like to comment on or to ask a question? If not, is it carried?

Carried.

Mr. FERRIE: Mr. Chairman and members, I want to say here how pleased we are that we have had this committee and I want to thank the Board of Grain Commissioners for coming down here and making everything as plain as they have made it in the answers they have given to us.

I am sure that what they have promised us about getting this report out and putting it in form so that the farmer will understand it should not cost too much money and I am sure the book will be a great help.

I have great pleasure in moving this resolution, that the report of the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada for 1951 be adopted and that the chairman report the same to the House.

The CHAIRMAN: You have all heard the motion.

All in agreement?

Carried.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, may I indulge your patience for just a moment to express to you, sir, and to the members of your committee our very deepest appreciation of your courtesy in giving us the opportunity to discuss these things with you.

We are exceedingly anxious in spite of some criticism you may have heard from time to time to give to the producer and the people interested in the grain trade the fullest possible information relative to the operation of the Board of Grain Commissioners. We want to lay every card on the table face up; we have nothing to hide and we are anxious that the people for whom the

Canada Grain Act was primarily drafted should be advised of the protection they have in it and because of that we appreciate very sincerely the opportunity of giving you the best service we can.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I do just one thing. This may make the faces of the boys on our staff a bit red. I want to pay tribute very sincerely and very heartily to the work that the three boys on our staff who have been with you today as well as their subordinates in their offices in Winnipeg have done during the last two or three years. You gentlemen do not know how hard they have worked. They have never hesitated to give their time.

Dr. Anderson, for instance, gives three or four Sundays as well as 15 to 18 hours a day during the week in checking that drying equipment when it first came into Saskatchewan. Arthur Dollery's gang has been spread around as they were never spread before and that has meant that his whole inspectional staff have been working exceedingly hard and I do not think I would be fair to our staff if I did not say to you men that we want to pay a tribute publicly to their co-operation, to their faithfulness and to their hard work. This also is equally true of Mr. Capon and his staff.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: Well, I would like to say just a word of appreciation for the services of the Grain Commissioners and their staff.

Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Vallance have been carrying an extra load due to the fact that the services of Mr. Milner have been generally used in his duty as Transport Controller. They have been on the job constantly and they have carried a very great responsibility in handling the worst crop that this country has ever handled from the marketing and transportation viewpoint.

I shall not tell you of the services of Mr. Milner. I have referred to that before. I would just like to refer to one service handled by Mr. Dollery. At the time the embargo was clamped on in connection with the foot and mouth disease, the embargo included hay and straw and a ruling came out from the United States Department of Agriculture that since screenings carried hay and straw, screenings were prohibited from entering the United States. We tried everything we could and we were getting nowhere, but someone had the presence of mind to send Mr. Dollery down to Washington with his samples and he was able to convince the Americans that screenings should be removed from the embargo. I do not know what would have happened to us this year—every elevator would have been clogged with screenings, except for the success of Mr. Dollery's mission. I think it is a tribute to the board and its services that we have a man who was able to handle that situation. I know my old friend Sid Capon, who worked at the head of the lakes side by side with me for a number of years. We have always been assured with him as chief weighmaster for the last 20 years, and we feel that the weighing branch of the operation is in excellent hands. I am not as familiar with the laboratory side as others are, but I think the fact that our samples are so well received overseas indicates that our laboratory side is also in excellent hands. I think that Canada is very fortunate in having the men who are represented here today to look after their grain problems.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, I think the next order of business on our agenda here is Bill No. 246, which you all have in your hands. It is an Act to amend the Canada Grain Act.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I might perhaps explain the bill. I have already done so in the House. It is not quite clear in the Act that the commissioner can be re-appointed for less than 10 years; and there are occasions when a shorter appointment is desirable, so we are making it clear in the Act that a commissioner can be re-appointed for a period of less than 10 years.

Section 2 of this Act provides for a revision of the salaries of the board. I believe the salaries were last fixed in 1931 and 1932, a good many years ago,

and this amendment brings the salaries into line with boards having comparable experience. It fixes the salary of the chief commissioner at \$14,000 a year, and the salaries of the two commissioners at \$12,000 per year. Then the new section 5 reduces the number of assistant grain commissioners from 4 to 3. It was felt that it was not necessary to fill the vacancy at the lakehead. The board is in very close touch with the lakehead and the problems there can be handled by the board and staff without the intervention of an assistant commissioner. That recommendation carries the judgment of the board.

Now, in section 3, the first amendment refers to the issuing of tickets. This is said to be the only new feature introduced into the grain system for a good many years. The present system requires several duplicate tickets to be made out individually by the elevator operator and the pressure on the elevator operator is getting more and more serious each year. The machine allows an original and several duplicates to be made in one operation, and one duplicate is held in the machine as a permanent record for the elevator company, and the others can be used for the various purposes the documents are issued for. A change in the Act is necessary to make it possible to introduce that machine. I am sorry I did not bring along the ticket that will be turned out by the machine—I have some in my office. It is believed that this will be a great labour saving device for the elevator operator and a rather better security for the documents themselves.

Now, subsections (2) and (3) of section 3 were to provide that the Governor in Council could make regulations. There has been some objection to these subsections. The reason they were put in was that in times of difficulty we have always been able to fall back on emergency legislation. For example, during the war it was thought necessary to defer the weighovers, and that was not done under the Grain Act but it was done under emergency legislation, under the War Measures Act at that time. This year with all the problems of handling tough and damp wheat it was thought necessary to defer the weighover and that was done under emergency legislation that was passed arising out of the Korean situation. It was thought that the Governor in Council should have power to vary the terms of the Grain Act to meet emergency situations. The Governor in Council is very reluctant to use general emergency legislation to amend a special Act. I am going to suggest that subsections (2) and (3) of that section be dropped. Apparently there is a feeling that it is an invasion of the farmer's charter. It will mean that there will be no way in future of avoiding a weighover. It means this year that each elevator will have to be tied up two or three weeks till it is weighed over. The Act calls for a weighover and the company will have to take it. We are not going to use emergency legislation for postponement. The transport controller will have to be appointed under emergency legislation. Otherwise I do not know how you can clothe the controller with proper authority unless you make provision in the Grain Act. We will look at this possibility next year. In the meantime, if it carries the judgment of the committee I will recommend that subsections (2) and (3) be withdrawn. We have had representations from the Saskatchewan and Manitoba pools and one or two others in this regard.

Mr. ROSS: That means you cannot make regulations by Governor in Council?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: That is it. I do not know how the committee feels about it. We put it in the Act with an innocent purpose in mind, and the reason we are taking it out is that we do not think it necessary if there are any serious objections to the legislation. When we come to that I will ask that a member of the committee move that subsections (2) and (3) of section 3 be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions?

Mr. BRYCE: Will the machines for the new duplicating system be purchased or will they be rented?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I think we can purchase them. I think the United Grain Growers know more about that than anybody else. Do you know, Mr. Watt, if they are to be purchased?

Mr. WATT: Yes, they are purchased.

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: These are the tickets which will be used in the machine.

Mr. WOOD: Does a weighover take place once a year?

The WITNESS: Between 9 and 22 months.

Mr. WRIGHT: Section 4 changes some of the statutory grains. Have the various grain handling firms and farm organizations been consulted on that?

Right Hon. Mr. HOWE: I would like Mr. McKenzie to explain that. The amendment requested by the Grain Board.

The WITNESS: This is a means of providing a certain weight per bushel for certain types of low and off grade grain, and it constituted a bit of a problem before because there was no weight per bushel prescribed before, and all we are doing is writing in the weight per bushel.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 1 carry?

Carried.

Shall clause 2 carry?

Carried.

Now we come to clause 3.

Mr. FAIR: Mr. Chairman, following clause 2, I think that is a good way of showing appreciation of the work the commission have done.

Mr. ROSS: Might I ask what the increases in salary have been for the commissioner and assistant commissioner?

The WITNESS: That is in the statute.

Mr. ROSS: It is now \$14,000?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: With respect to clause 3, you have heard the suggestion of the minister that section 2 was eliminated and the section was moved up. Would someone like to move regarding section 3?

Mr. GEORGE: Yes, Mr. Chairman; I will move that sub-clause 2 be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

Agreed.

Shall clause 3, as amended, carry?

Carried.

Shall clause 4 carry?

Carried.

Shall clause 5 carry?

Carried.

Shall the preamble carry?

Carried.

Shall the title carry?

Carried.

Shall the bill carry?

Carried.

Shall I report the bill?

Carried.

Mr. ROSS: That was pretty short and sweet.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee will adjourn to meet again at the call of the Chair.

GOVT PUBNS

BINDING SECT. JUN 11 1980

GOVT PUBNS

